DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 271 703 CG 019 242

AUTHOR	Scott, Gary J.
TITLE	The Organization and Scope of College Relations and Recruiting.
INSTITUTION	College Placement Council, Bethlehem, Pa.
PUB DATE	84
NOTE	260p.
AVAILABLE FROM	College Placement Council Foundation, 62 Highland Avenue, Bethlehem, PA 18017.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Students; *Employment Practices; *Higher Education; *Personnel Selection; *Recruitment; *School Business Relationship

ABSTRACT

This document presents the findings of 1982 surveys of college relations/recruiting managers and chief executive officers who were employer members of the College Placement Council. These surveys collected the following information: (1) type of industry; (2) division of responsibilities for recruiting within organization; (3) types of activities included in the organization's college relations/recruiting program; (4) costs of recruiting; (5) number of hires; (6) usefulness of the College Placement Council; (7) past and future changes in recruiting; (8) importance the chief executive officer assigns to recruiting; and (9) the involvement of the chief executive officer in recruiting. The document consists largely of tabulated survey results. Results from the recruiting manager survey are divided into 15 industrial categories. The chief executive officer survey is not divided and is presented with four tables. Appendices include the survey instruments and a table listing responses from college relations and recruiting managers by industry and size of organization. (ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED271703

The Organization and Scope of College Relations and Recruiting

CG 019242

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W. Kaufman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CPC FOUNDATION

THE ORGANIZATION AND SCOPE OF COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING

BY DR. GARY J. SCOTT

THE AUTHOR

Gary J. Scott is director of career planning and placement and director of corporate relations at Northern Illinois University. Prior to this, he served as director of both counseling and financial aid and as assistant to the vice president of student affairs at The Pennsylvania State University.

Dr. Scott has been a consultant to government agencies, private business, and higher education institutions. He has received grants from the "Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education," the CPC Foundation, and The Pennsylvania State University Foundation.

Dr. Scott's recent publications include The Career Planning and Placement Office: Implications for the Future and "Career Search, Selection, and Entry," a chapter in the recently published Handbook of Vocational Psychology, edited by Osipow and Walsh. In addition, he has made numerous presentations at conferences and professional associations.

Active in the American College Personnel Association, Dr. Scott served as treasurer and member of the executive council. He also is a member of the American Association for Counseling and Development and the Midwest College Placement Association. He holds master's and doctoral degrees from The Pennsylvania State University and a bachelor's degree from Beloit College.

Copyright 1984 by the

CPC Foundation
62 Highland Avenue
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18017
SAN 201-7822
ISBN 0-914885-07-3

PREFACE

This study of college relations and recruiting activity in the United States was proposed to the CPC Foundation in March 1982, and conducted over the late summer and early fall when data for the just-concluded 1981-82 recruiting year would be available.

The study addressed a number of questions, the answers to which would provide a descriptive summary of the then-present state of college relations and recruiting and serve as a guide to organizations in developing new programs or in modifying or expanding existing programs. The timing of the study coincided with the release by the College Placement Council, Inc., (CPC) of the book, College Relations and Recruiting, and the two together should serve as effective companion works for organizations engaged in college relations and recruiting.

An advisory committee, appointed by the CPC Foundation, provided invaluable assistance especially during the developmental stages of the questionnaires and the reporting format. Special thanks are due to Agnes Canning, Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Co.; Susan Krasney, Illinois Bell Telephone Co.; Robert LaBrot, Altschuler, Melvoin and Glasser; Ira Pfeiffer, IBM Corporation; and George Yoxall, Inland Steel Co., for serving on that committee.

Thanks are also due the CPC Foundation for its assistance and support for the study and to Dr. Catherine Kandefer, for her coordination of this project.

CONTENTS

Page

The Author . . . i

Preface . . . iii

Contents . . . v

Overview . . . 1

Methodology . . . 3

Discussion of Findings . . . 5
  Survey of Chief Executive Officers . . . 6
  Survey of College Relations/Recruiting Managers . . . 10

Industrial Reports

  Accounting, Public . . . 15
  Banking, Finance, and Insurance . . . 30
  Merchandising (Retail and Wholesale) and Services . . . 47
  Aerospace, Electronics, and Instruments . . . 62
  Automotive, Tire and Rubber, and Mechanical Equipment . . . 79
  Building Materials Manufacturers and Construction . . . 91
  Chemicals, Drugs, and Allied Products . . . 105
  Electrical Machinery and Equipment . . . 121
  Food and Beverage Processing . . . 135
  Glass, Paper, Packaging, and Allied Products . . . 150
  Metals and Metal Products . . . 165
  Petroleum and Allied Products (Including Natural Gas) . . . 183
  Research and Consulting Organizations . . . 200
  Utilities--Public (Including Transportation) . . . 215
  Government--All Levels, and Non-Profit Organizations . . . 233

Appendix A: Survey Form for College Relations and Recruiting Managers . . . 246

Appendix B: Survey Form for Chief Executive Officers . . . 251

Appendix C: Response from College Relations and Recruiting Managers by Industry and Size of Organization . . . 253

OVERVIEW

The general lack of data describing the organization and scope of college relations and recruiting activities prompted this study. The recent history of college relations and recruiting is especially interesting and confusing, even to the practiced observer. Projected surpluses of engineers and other technical graduates have not materialized and those who predicted the end to college recruiting as it was known in the 1960's have been only partially correct. Despite a few down years in hiring due to economic recessions, industrial slumps (e.g., aerospace in the early 1970's and the more recent slump in the auto industry) and the general increase in the number of available graduates, recruiting activities, especially for technical graduates, have remained strong and in many cases grown over recent years.

Some employers are quite sophisticated in targeting key institutions as suppliers of graduates and in their methods of establishing and maintaining productive relationships with those institutions. Other employers, especially the smaller ones and those who are new to college recruiting, have great difficulty in gaining what they feel is their fair market share. Still other employers seem to be on a recruiting roller coaster with little consistency of effort and result, even in periods of relative stability or growth in manpower needs.

It was felt that a study of the college relations and recruiting function would prove invaluable at this time to employers who actively recruit college graduates or who intend to do so in the near future, particularly a study which provides breakdowns of practices by industry.

Specific questions addressed include:

1. How does senior management regard college relations and recruiting activities in their organizations and to what extent do they support these activities?

2. What are the factors which influence the establishment, size and scope of college relations and recruiting (both now and over the past five years)?

3. What are the reporting lines for the college relations and recruiting function and what are the typical organizational patterns?

4. What portion of total college graduate hiring is accomplished through college relations and recruiting efforts as opposed to informal hiring (e.g., walk-ins, write-ins, and referrals)?

5. At what management levels are decisions made which affect college relations and recruiting activities (e.g., number and mix of graduates sought, decision to hire a given individual, starting salary ranges, budget, etc.)?

6. What are the typical staffing patterns (number of staff, percent of time devoted to activity, usual job functions, special training, etc.) for the college relations and recruiting function?

7. What is the scope of present college relations and recruiting activities and how effective is each activity judged to be?

8. What is the volume of present recruiting activity (number of colleges visited, number of graduates interviewed, number invited for second visit, number of offers, number of hires)?

9. What is the average cost per new hire?

10. What are factors found to be most attractive to new graduates (salary, geographic location, training program, educational benefit program, etc.)?

11. What has been done to compensate for inability to hire (raise starting salaries, establish training programs and train our own, move to new location, etc.)?

12. How frequently are hiring quotas reviewed (weekly, monthly, quarterly, annually)?

13. Have you noted any changes over the past five years in the graduates themselves, in the job market, in the economy, or in your organization which have affected your college relations and recruiting program? How have these changes affected your program?

METHODOLOGY

Two survey instruments were developed (one for chief executive officers and one for college relations/recruiting managers). Copies of the survey instruments are included as Appendices A and B of this report.

A random sample of 2,000 (54 percent) of the 3,726 employer members of the College Placement Council and/or the seven regional placement associations was selected and the survey forms were mailed to college relations/recruiting managers on August 16, 1982. The deadline for return of this survey was September 11. A follow-up reminder was sent to all nonrespondents and an additional telephone call was placed to a sample of nonrespondents. Usable responses were received from 577 organizations (29 percent).

The second survey form was sent to the chief executive officer of 500 (every fourth one) of the organizations sampled above. Surveys were sent on September 12, 1982, with a return deadline of October 9. A follow-up reminder was mailed to nonrespondents. Usable responses were received from 88 organizations (18 percent).

Assurances of confidentiality in the treatment of response data were given to both the chief executive officers and college relations/recruiting managers. Neither references to individual organizations nor a list of participating organizations are included in this report.

Completed surveys returned from college relations/recruiting managers were coded by industry (18 industrial categories corresponding to CPC categories) and size (seven categories ranging from less than 1,000 to more than 20,000 employees). The industrial categories were reduced to 15 for reporting purposes. Two related categories--federal, state and local government and non-profit organizations--with small numbers of responses were merged into a single category. Also, the tire and rubber category and the automotive and mechanical equipment categories were merged for the same reason. Responses from organizations which could not be properly classified in any of these 15 categories (26 in all) were not reported due to the great diversity.

The seven size categories utilized on the survey forms were reduced to six for reporting purposes due to small numbers of organizations responding in the 10,001-15,000 and 15,001-20,000 employee ranges. The two categories were simply merged.

Responses from college relations and recruiting managers by industrial and size classification are reported in Appendix C.

Because of the low response rate from chief executive officers (18 percent), it was determined that data obtained from this group would be consolidated into a single report, rather than in separate industrial reports.

Both the report of responses from chief executive officers and the 15 industrial reports representing the responses from college relations and recruiting managers are essentially straightforward factual presentations of the data reported. It was felt an attempt to interpret data would be inappropriate in the face of a deteriorating national economic climate which found many organizations either in the midst of or entering a period of declining activity in the college relations and recruiting function.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Because of the volume of data collected and the reporting format whereby separate reports for each of the 15 industrial categories have been prepared, a discussion of each item is presented in the individual reports. These reports are straightforward factual presentations of data obtained from respondents. As pointed out previously, the national economic condition at the time of the survey and its impact on the college relations and recruiting of many organizations caution against attempts to interpret that data beyond those interpretations made or implied by respondents themselves. There are, however, a number of general findings and observations which warrant attention.

The overall response to the two surveys was not as large as initially hoped for, although the representation of industries in the response groups closely parallels the representation of those industries in the CPC and regional placement association employer memberships.

Letters received from both participating and nonparticipating organizations pointed out a high degree of interest in the survey results and also provided at least a partial explanation for the low response rate. Many organizations indicated that surveys for college relations/recruiting managers were not returned because some portion of the data requested was not readily available, the data was only available in a form different from that requested, or that staff time was simply not available to complete the form. Twenty-seven responses from nonparticipating organizations were received which indicated that staffing for college relations and recruiting had been severely reduced or that the function was not being staffed at all. Telephone follow-ups with a sample of 20 nonrespondents yielded similar results. Undoubtedly, the length of the survey itself also contributed to the response rate from college relations and recruiting managers.

SURVEY OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

Survey materials sent to chief executive officers (CEOs) carried an appeal that if the CEO elected to have someone else complete the form, a person be selected who reflected the CEO's views. Of the 88 returned forms, only 10 were completed by a CEO. The vast majority of the remaining 78 were completed by someone from the personnel area, often by the person responsible for the college relations and recruiting function. Suspecting that this might occur, the initial mailing was made after the deadline for return of the college relations and recruiting managers survey to reduce the possibility that the same person would simultaneously complete both forms. Data collected from the CEO survey, however, can be questioned as to whether it does in fact represent the views of CEOs or instead an interpretation of those views through the eyes of others. Readers are cautioned to read the findings with this in mind.

Responses to the question "What degree of importance do you (CEO) personally assign the college relations and recruiting function in your organization?" show that 63 rated the function at a high importance level, 21 at a moderate level of importance, and two at a low level of importance. Specific expectations for the college relations and recruiting staff varied somewhat (see Table 1) but there was agreement among a majority of respondents (63 percent) that attracting and hiring quality candidates was a priority. Seventy-seven of the respondents indicated that their expectations were being met, three said expectations were being partially met, and five said expectations were not being met.

TABLE 1
SPECIFIC EXPECTATIONS FOR COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING STAFF

Expectation	Frequency*
Attract and hire quality candidates	55
Maintain good relations with campuses	21
Attract a sufficient number of candidates to meet needs	10
Coordinate total campus recruiting effort	7
Select and hire candidates in a cost-effective manner	6
Promote the industry and/or the company	5
Respond to company and university needs	3
Be knowledgeable about entry-level positions in the company	3

(Continued)

Table 1 (Continued)

Expectation	Frequency*
Be professional in relationships with colleges and universities	2
Promote EEO standards in-house and on campuses	2
Exercise good judgment in interviewing and hiring	1
Maintain a favorable company image	1
Strengthen ties with students/campuses through internships	1
Maintain up-to-date salary and offer information	1
Increase offer to acceptance rate	1
Maintain 60 percent acceptance rate	1
Involvement in professional organizations	1
Implement a larger program	1

*Some provided multiple responses

The CEO survey asked what was considered to be the single most important thing the college relations and recruiting staff does or should be doing. Table 2 reports responses to this question. It is interesting to note that in Table 1 a majority of responses concerning expectations were bottom-line or results-oriented, whereas the responses to this question are more equally distributed between the desired results (e.g., attract/screen/hire the best individuals) and the methods for achieving that result (e.g., maintain effective communication/relationships with placement/campus community and represent company to its best advantage).

TABLE 2
SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT THING COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING DOES/SHOULD BE DOING

Activity	Frequency*
Attract/screen/hire the best individuals	41
Maintain effective relationships and communications with placement personnel/campus community	36
Represent company to its best advantage	13
Operate a cost-effective program	5
Coordination and timely follow-through	4
Increase student awareness of opportunities and challenges	3
Respond to management's manpower needs	2
Help provide proper environment/reduce turnover	2
Meet AA objectives	1

(Continued)

Table 2 (Continued)

Activity	Frequency*
Keep senior management aware of needs for a sustained program	1
Keep in touch with changing technology	1
Select management talent	1
Monitor corporate recruiting activities	1
Hire a representative number from each campus	1

*Some provided multiple responses

A variety of responses and little consensus were found among CEOs and their designees to the question "What in your judgment will be the greatest change(s) in college relations/recruiting over the next several years?" (see Table 3).

TABLE 3
GREATEST CHANGES EXPECTED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/ RECRUITING OVER THE NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
Increased recruiting competition (usually for technical graduates)	18
More pressure to identify exceptional candidates/more pre-screening of candidates/less open interviewing	10
Increased emphasis on college relations	7
Continued imbalances or fluctuations in supply and demand (especially in technical fields)	7
Developing closer relationships with selected/ productive colleges	6
Improved screening and selection methods/computer-assisted screening	5
Closer examination of cost-effectiveness of college recruiting	5
Learning to cope with reduced hiring	4
More professional, higher quality recruiting	4
Shift recruiting emphasis to non-technical or non-traditional students	3
Reducing the number of campuses visited/rely more on local campuses	3
Increased emphasis on identifying/hiring minority candidates	3
Declines in demand for non-technical graduates	3

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

Change	Frequency
Must deal with/resolve problems related to escalating starting salaries and salary compression	2
Demand for more mature/experienced graduates	2
Alternatives to campus recruiting will be developed/ more use of alumni services	2
Greater corporate controls on recruiting activity	2
Increased corporate manpower planning	2
More money will need to be spent on promotions & displays	2
Maintaining visibility while reducing hiring	1
Over-supply of technical graduates	1
Further erosion of salary offer differential between public and private sector	1
More corporate involvement at high school level to encourage students to consider high demand/ technical careers	1
Hiring from a more diverse group of campuses	1
More involvement by third party recruiters	1
Generally increased demand for college graduates	1
Organizations will have to be more concerned with own as well as industry's image	1
Decreases in qualified faculty	1

An attempt was made to determine the extent to which the CEO becomes personally involved in certain college relations and recruiting activities. Results would suggest that CEOs are aware of and fairly extensively involved in certain activities. In fact, a majority (45 or more) of CEOs are reported to be personally involved in seven of the nine listed activities. In many cases involvement is confined to executive review, such as with reviewing the results of college relations/recruiting where 73 of the 88 CEOs are reported to be involved. (See Table 4.)

TABLE 4
ACTIVITIES IN WHICH THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER BECOMES INVOLVED

Activity	Frequency
Reviewing the results of college relations/recruiting	73
Encouraging executive participation in college relations/recruiting	64
Establishing or approving policy	64
Involvement in establishing criteria for evaluating college relations/recruiting	53
On-campus visits or contacts	49
Establishing or approving budget	49
Establishing or approving starting salary offers	45
Establishing or approving hiring quotas	40
Greeting candidates in the office	32
Other	9*

*No two responses the same

Finally, the question "Do you (CEO) feel it is important for your organization to maintain a visibility on college campuses during periods of little or no hiring?" An overwhelmingly positive response was recorded (81, or 92 percent of respondents).

On balance, the data obtained from the CEO survey are positive and supportive of college relations activities. Readers are again, however, cautioned that the majority of respondents were the designees of the CEOs and as such could represent a restricted or biased viewpoint.

SURVEY OF COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING MANAGERS

The vast majority of organizations represented in the response group has a person at the corporate level who is responsible for the college relations/recruiting function. In several cases this centralization of responsibility was reported as a recent move in order to gain tighter control on the entire hiring process during a period of reduced hiring or staff reduction. This is reported as a general finding and is not specific to any single industrial category. The organizational pattern for college relations/recruiting in a majority of participating organizations is either the combination pattern (coordinated at the corporate level but work carried out at the operating unit level) or the centralized pattern (all handled at the corporate level). Some variations exist in the different industrial categories and in organizations of different size.

Titles for those responsible for college relations/recruiting vary considerably and reflect the wide range of responsibilities and specializations often found within the larger personnel areas. Similarly, the titles of persons to whom the college relations/recruiting managers report are varied but are predominantly within the broader area of personnel.

The size of both full-time and part-time recruiting staffs varied with the size of organizations and also varied with the extent to which operating units were directly involved with the college relations/recruiting efforts. There are data to suggest that there is considerable variation in cost-effectiveness of recruiting from one organization to another. This is evidenced in both the variations in reported cost per graduate hired (out-of-pocket expense related to college recruiting such as recruiter and candidate travel, literature, advertising, etc., and excluding personnel salaries) and in indirect costs reflected in the number of personnel drawn upon to assist on a part-time basis (e.g., line managers) in campus recruiting and other college relations/recruiting activities.

It is apparent that many college relations/recruiting staffs have either not been called upon to provide average cost per hire figures or that there are no generally accepted standards for calculating those costs. Certainly, few college relations/recruiting managers reported that the cost per hire or cost-effectiveness is among the criteria by which the performance of their program was evaluated. However, there were suggestions throughout the data that these factors will be given more weight in the future. Perhaps this is an area where CPC and/or the regional associations can be helpful to employer members through the development of guidelines or standards for determining hiring costs and cost-effectiveness of operations.

The primary criteria for performance evaluations in college relations and recruiting were reported to be either number of hires, meeting hiring goals or quotas, or offer to acceptance ratios. Some references to cost-effectiveness and quality of candidates were found but these measures of performance were generally obscured by quantitative measure.

Firms reporting hiring reductions and/or greater control of hiring seemed more likely to apply cost and quality measures than firms which reported growth in hiring.

The extent to which college relations and recruiting programs engaged in 17 activities varied considerably from activity to activity and, to some extent, from one industrial group to another. The activities engaged in by the greatest number of firms were printed recruiting material, cultivating key faculty/staff contacts, providing speakers to faculty or student organizations, and participating in campus career days. In certain industries, activities such as summer hiring of students, hiring students through co-op or intern programs and contributions of cash or equipment to selected campuses are engaged in to a much greater extent. Priority activities also vary from industry to industry but roughly parallel those same activities cited above.

The practice of offering hiring bonuses or other incentives to recent college graduates was reported by a very small minority of firms. Similarly, few firms reported that they used agencies or search firms to hire recent graduates into entry level jobs. In those limited instances where either the use of incentives or agencies was reported, they were utilized primarily to hire majors in high technology fields, advanced degree recipients or graduates in financial areas. Only a portion of those firms utilizing agencies or search firms reported that they would pay related fees.

A relatively small number of firms reported having utilized external consultants to review their college relations/recruiting operations. A much larger number of firms reported having a formal training program for personnel who would be engaged in campus interviewing. It was surprising, however, to note the number of firms that did not offer training to campus interviewers. There are considerable differences noted from industry to industry. Here again is an area where the College Placement Council and the regional associations could contribute by developing and offering interviewer training to employer members.

Data obtained from participating firms concerning the management level at which certain decisions relating to college relations were made were inconsistently reported (some firms responded with titles, some with levels, and still others with a combination of responses) and could not be accurately summarized for reporting purposes.

Nearly all firms reported some form of periodic review of hiring quotas. Frequency of these reviews vary from organization to organization and from industry to industry. Many organizations conduct only annual reviews and a small number conduct reviews more frequently during the present period of decreased hiring. The latter was not reported by a large enough number of firms to suggest a general trend, however.

Four survey items were directed toward identifying problems, changes or projected changes in college relations and recruiting. Findings are reported in Tables 5 through 8 of the individual industrial reports and are perhaps more relevant in the context of a particular industry. Perhaps the most common thread running through these data is the anticipation of continued high demand for and short supply of engineering and other technical graduates. Intensified competition for these and top graduates in other disciplines and continued salary escalation and problems related to salary compression are directly related issues and are also anticipated by many.

Concerns relating to cost-effectiveness of college recruiting, employer pre-selection of students to be interviewed on campus, dual career couples, increased private support to higher education, increased use of computers and other technology in screening and selection of candidates, and the need for better models for manpower planning and candidate screening are a few examples of topics which, while only reported by a small number of respondents, may well represent new or emerging issues for the future.

The volume of recruiting activity during the 1981-82 recruiting year by participating firms was collected and is reported in Tables 9 through 15 of each industrial report. Firms providing only partial data were excluded. While 1981-82 was not an ideal year to study recruiting activity because of the imposition of hiring freezes and reductions in hiring quotas by many organizations, the data reported in these tables provide a basis for an organization to compare the relative effectiveness of its recruiting activity with the activity of similar organizations over a specified period of time. The tables may also offer a model for an organization to analyze its effectiveness in certain phases of the recruiting process from both a results and cost standpoint. In addition to the data provided in Tables 9 through 15, information is also presented which represents the changes reported by participating organizations in the percentage of new graduates hired during the 1981-82 recruiting year compared with the previous year and the average of the previous five years. Similar information is reported concerning the percent change in campuses recruited during 1981-82 with the average of previous years. It is in these figures that the impact of the economy on business in general and on specific industries is most evident.

College relations/recruiting managers were asked to identify those factors considered when determining whether a particular campus was included in recruiting. Four primary factors emerged: location of the campus in relation to major operations, the quality of academic programs/graduates, past success recruiting at the campus, and whether the campus offered majors sought. While the final factor would seem self-evident, it was nonetheless listed by many respondents.

Since many college students inquire about the appropriateness of negotiating with an employer over job offer terms, one item relating to this was included in the survey. Of four factors listed (deadline for response to a job offer, starting salary, location of employment, and starting date), two were almost universally considered open for negotiation--deadline for response to a job offer and starting date. Few respondents reported that salary and location were negotiable.

The final item reported in the industrial surveys related to changes noted in the graduates themselves. Responses were so varied that it is difficult to identify trends. There is one issue which perhaps warrants some attention since it corresponds to findings of several recent research studies. In most of the industrial reports a few responses suggest that college graduates (especially those in high demand fields) have become more demanding of employers both in terms of salary, working conditions and promotional opportunities and also non-job or quality of life issues such as climate, vacation benefits, recreational and social opportunities, etc.

The following individual industrial reports present much more specific findings for each industrial category and, for many items, by organization size.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTING

Fifteen public accounting firms participated in the study by returning completed forms. All size categories are represented, however, the number of firms in any category is small. (See Table 1.)

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE

SIZE (Number of Employees)

	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
NUMBER RESPONDING	6	1	3	2	2	1	15

RESPONSIBILITY FOR AND ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING

All but one firm reported that there was a person at the corporate level responsible for all college relations/recruiting activities. (See Table 2.a.) Titles varied considerably for the person (See Table 2.b), however, a great deal of variation in title is accounted for by the large firms which tend to add the word "national" in the title, thus reflecting responsibility for the function at multiple locations. Years of tenure in the position ranged from one to 10 with the average being 4.4 years.

TABLE 2.a
IS THERE A PERSON AT THE CORPORATE LEVEL RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL COLLEGE RELATIONS/ RECRUITING ACTIVITIES OF YOUR ORGANIZATION?

SIZE (Number of Employees)

RESPONSE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	6	0	3	2	2	1	14
NO	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	6	1	3	2	2	1	15

TABLE 2.b
TITLE OF PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Director of Personnel	3						3
Administrative Manager	1						1
Personnel Partner	1						1
National Director of Personnel			1				1
Director, Professional Recruitment			1				1
National Director of Human Resources			1				1
Partner, Recruitment/College Relations				1			1
National Director of Personnel Development				1			1
National Director, Recruiting					1		1
Partner					1		1
Partner/Director Recruiting U.S.						1	1
No Response	1	1					2
TOTAL	6	1	3	2	2	1	15

Table 2.c shows the titles of the person to whom the corporate college relations/recruiting coordinator reports. A wide variety of reporting lines is noted with smaller firms more likely to report to a board or committee than larger firms.

TABLE 2.c
TITLE OF PERSON TO WHOM CORPORATE COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING COORDINATOR REPORTS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Administrative Board	1						1
Management Committee	1						1
Executive Committee	1			1			2
National Managing Partner	1						1
Managing Partner	1						1
National Director, Personnel Development			1				1
National Director, Human Resources			1				1
Executive Partner			1				1
Partner, Human Resources				1			1
National Director, Personnel Recruitment and Management					1		1
National Director, Personnel					1		1
Director, Partner Affairs						1	1
No Response	1	1					2
TOTAL	6	1	3	2	2	1	15

Respondents were further asked to indicate which of three organizational patterns best describes their college relations and recruiting activities: Centralized (all handled at the corporate level); Combination (coordinated at corporate level but work carried out at operating unit level); or, Decentralized (all handled at operating unit level). Table 2.d shows that among responding firms the combination approach to college relations and recruiting is favored by most, with smaller firms most likely to be centralized. The latter is no doubt found among those smaller firms operating out of a single or small number of locations.

TABLE 2.d
ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING FUNCTION

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
ORGANIZATION	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Centralized	3						3
Combination	3	1	3	2	1	1	11
Decentralized					1		1
TOTAL	6	1	3	2	2	1	15

In terms of staffing for college relations and recruiting, firms were asked to indicate both the number of persons who devote a majority of their time to the function and the number who devote a lesser amount of time (e.g., personnel who conduct campus interviews). Tables 2.e and 2.f show the responses and point out a direct relationship between firm size and number of personnel involved (both full- and part-time). Most of the firms reported that a majority of part-time college relations and recruiting staff were drawn from operating areas other than personnel. The median reported for part-time staff drawn from some personnel function was only 10 percent (range from 0 percent to 30 percent from personnel except for one firm of under 1,000 employees where all college relations staff were from personnel and all devoted less than one-half of their time to the function).

The survey asked respondents to indicate the management level at which certain decisions relating to college relations and recruiting were made (e.g., hiring decision, invitation for second interviews, starting salaries, etc.). Responses were so varied that little usable data could be reported. Generally speaking, however, the number and mix of majors sought, college relations/recruiting budget, and starting salaries were decisions reserved to senior executive staff.

TABLE 2.e
NUMBER OF PERSONS DEVOTING A MAJORITY OF TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	2	1					3
1	4						4
5			1				1
6			1	1			2
10			1	1			2
15					1		1
35						1	1
150					1		1
TOTAL	6	1	3	2	2	1	15

TABLE 2.f
NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL DEVOTING SOME TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
2		1					1
3	1						1
4	1						1
5	1						1
9	1						1
15	1						1
25	1						1
30			1				1
90			1				1
100			1	1			2
200				1	1		2
550					1	1	2
TOTAL	6	1	3	2	2	1	15

EVALUATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

All firms responded to the item: "Are there criteria by which the performance of your college relations/recruiting program is evaluated?" Ten firms responded affirmatively and five indicated there were no performance criteria. Of the criteria cited by respondents, meeting hiring quotas or maintaining strong hire to offer ratios was cited by five firms and maintaining good campus contacts was cited by four firms. Generally speaking, larger firms were most likely to indicate that a formal evaluation was conducted but were also more vague as to performance criteria.

ACTIVITIES UTILIZED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Seventeen different activities associated with college relations/recruiting were listed on the survey form and respondents were asked to indicate the activities their firm engaged in and those which were considered high priority. (See Table 3.)

The provision of printed material was an activity engaged in by all 15 firms while participation in campus career days (13), cultivating key faculty/staff contacts and providing speakers (12 each), and cultivating key student contacts (11) followed in frequency of use. Cultivating key faculty/staff contacts (10) and cultivating key student contacts (8) were clearly rated high priority by the greatest number of firms. The two most popular activities (printed recruiting material and participating in career days) were not listed as high priorities by a majority of firms.

TABLE 3
ACTIVITIES NORMALLY USED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Printed recruiting material	6 (2)	1	3 (2)	2 (1)	2	1 (1)	15 (6)
Audio/visual recruiting material			3	2		1 (1)	6 (1)
Cultivating key faculty/staff contacts	4 (4)		3 (3)	2 (2)	2 (1)	1	12 (10)
Cultivating key student contacts	4 (3)		3 (2)	2 (2)	2 (1)		11 (8)
Providing speakers to faculty or student organizations	4 (2)		3 (2)	2	2 (1)	1	12 (5)
Scholarships or grants awarded to an academic department or institution to support student aid (based on either academic performance or financial need)	2 (1)		3 (1)	2	2		9 (2)
Summer hiring of students	1		3	2	2		8
Summer hiring of faculty			2	2	2	1 (1)	7 (1)
Participating in campus career days	6 (1)	1	1	2	2	1	13 (1)
Hiring students through co-op, intern or other similar programs sponsored by a campus	5 (2)		3 (1)	2	2 (1)		12 (4)

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Conferences or seminars for placement personnel and faculty at your expense			2	2	2	1 (1)	7 (1)
Contribution of cash or equipment to selected campuses	1		3 (1)	2	2		8 (1)
Sponsorship of student or faculty projects, such as research			2	2	2		6
Hospitality hours for faculty, placement personnel, or students at professional conferences	1		2	2	2		7
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students while you are on campus	3 (1)		2	2	1		8 (1)
Gifts of advertising materials, e.g., pens, lighters, desk accessories, etc.	1		1				2
Advertising through campus newspapers			2	1			3

*First number represents frequency of use while number in parentheses represents high priority activity as indicated by respondents.

Another way of getting at high priority activities was to ask firms to indicate what they considered the single most important thing they could do to assure productive recruiting year in and year out. The importance of maintaining good communication with campuses was clearly evident as eight of the 12 firms responding to this item indicated either continuity of effort or communication in their responses. Pre-recruiting of students and sending the best recruiter to the campus were each listed by two firms.

Recently, a number of organizations have been reported to be utilizing either hiring bonuses or search firms to attract new college graduates. Clearly these practices are not popular among public accounting firms at this time as only one firm reported the use of hiring bonuses or other incentives and no firms reported that they utilized search firms for new graduates.

Similarly, employers were asked whether they utilized external consultants to review college relations/recruiting operations or to train staff. Four firms (varied in size) reported the use of external consultants while 11 had not. Most firms (13) had developed their own recruiter training program while two utilized external trainers for this purpose. (See Table 4.)

TABLE 4
FORMAL INTERVIEWER TRAINING PROGRAMS*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	4	1	3	2	2	1	13
NO	2						2
TOTAL	6	1	3	2	2	1	15

*Of those having formal training programs, the programs last from 3 to 24 hours and average 12.4 hours in length. Only four firms indicated they had ever used external consultants to train staff or to review their college relations recruiting program.

COST PER NEW GRADUATE HIRED

The average cost (out-of-pocket expense excluding salaries of staff) per new graduate hired was reported by only six firms and ranged from $400 to $10,000 with the median cost at $500. Most firms did not have average cost per hire figures available or calculated those costs in a manner different from that used for this study.

FREQUENCY OF HIRING QUOTA REVIEW

All firms reported frequent periodic reviews of hiring quotas with 13 indicating quotas were reviewed weekly as well as over longer periods of time.

Several items relating to change in the college relations/recruiting function over time were included in the survey. Tables 5 through 8 report results.

TABLE 5
GREATEST CHANGES NOTED OVER PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
Greater competition for top graduates	4
Increases in pre-recruiting activities	3
Better college facilities and involvement	3
Increases in number of graduates	1
Increases in number of women candidates	1
Greater sophistication in interview scheduling	1
More professionalism	1
Students more pro-business	1
Gauging activity to result	1
Controlling number of colleges visited	1

TABLE 6
GREATEST CHANGES TO BE MADE OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
Controlling cost of recruiting	4
Educating employers and/or students to each other's needs	2
Utilization of computers (in recruiting)	1
Responding to economic conditions	1
Facing competition for top graduates	1
Mounting pressure for pre-selection	1
Finding jobs for all graduates	1

TABLE 7
GREATEST PROBLEM (OTHER THAN ECONOMY) FACING EMPLOYERS OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Problem	Frequency
Increased competition for top graduates	2
Lack of support from top management	1
Lack of placement ethics	1
Cost-effectiveness	1
Grade inflation	1
Keeping current	1
Helping graduates adjust to work	1
Declining demand	1
Utilization of liberal arts graduates in a poor economy	1

TABLE 8
HAS YOUR ORGANIZATION HAD TO MAKE ANY DRASTIC CHANGES DUE TO THE CONDITIONS OF THE JOB MARKET OR DUE TO CHANGES IN RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATES?

Response*	Frequency
YES	6
NO	9

*Changes Made	Frequency
Escalate salaries/salary compression	2
Screen more thoroughly	1
Reduce number of campuses visited	1
Strengthen recruiting to compete	1
Attempt to enhance company image	1

Because of the small number of organizations responding, it is difficult to identify trends through responses to these items, with the possible exception that change seems to impact smaller organizations more heavily than larger ones.

VOLUME OF RECRUITING ACTIVITY REPORTED

Table 9 reports the number of recent college graduate hires made by reporting firms during the 1981-82 recruiting year. These figures represent hires from all sources (campus and non-campus).

TABLE 9
RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATE HIRES DURING 1981-82 RECRUITING YEAR

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
RANGE	3-31	40	210-300	1,000-1,500	1,400-1,500	3,150
AVERAGE NUMBER	12	40	270	1,250	1,450	3,150

Firms were additionally asked to indicate the percent of hires from both campus and non-campus sources, however, responses were inconsistent and results could not be reported. The vast majority of new college graduate hires did come from campus sources as evidenced by comparing.

Tables 10 through 15 report campus recruiting activity (number of campuses visited, number of campus interviews conducted, number of candidates invited for second interviews, acceptance of invitation for second interview, employment offers, and acceptances).

TABLE 10
NUMBER OF CAMPUSES VISITED FOR RECRUITING PURPOSES

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
CAMPUSES VISITED	3-10	15	116-160	315-600	380-430	520
AVERAGE	7	15	143	458	405	520

TABLE 11
NUMBER OF CANDIDATES INTERVIEWED DURING RECRUITING VISITS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INTERVIEWS	120-225	250	3,100-5,500	13,500-16,000	16,000	30,000
AVERAGE	182	250	4,667	14,750	16,000	30,000

TABLE 12
CANDIDATES INVITED FOR SECOND INTERVIEWS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INVITATIONS	17-90	125	700-1,460	4,100	3,700-5,900	8,800
AVERAGE	48	125	1,170	4,100	4,800	8,800

TABLE 13
CANDIDATES ACCEPTING INVITATION FOR SECOND INTERVIEW

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
ACCEPTANCES	15-80	115	625-1,260	3,950	3,550-5,900	8,000
AVERAGE	42	115	1,028	3,950	3,825	8,000

TABLE 14
OFFERS OF EMPLOYMENT

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
OFFERS	8-55	80	500-800	3,000	2,900-3,500	6,000
AVERAGE	29	80	653	3,000	3,200	6,000

TABLE 15
HIRES RESULTING FROM CAMPUS RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
HIRES	3-23	40	190-300	1,250	1,400-1,500	3,150
AVERAGE	11	40	233	1,250	1,450	3,150

These tables provide readers with average figures which represent the experience of 15 public accounting firms of various size in college recruiting during the 1981-82 recruiting year. It is difficult to speculate the effect the economy may have had in this area as several firms indicated that the percent of offers accepted was higher than in recent years. On the other hand, nine of the firms responding to the survey indicated that they had hired from 5 percent to 100 percent more graduates during 1981-82 than in 1980-81 and 11 reported hiring from 10 percent to 50 percent more than the average for the last five years. Only two firms reported decreases from 1980-81 levels and from the average of the past five years (both firms under 1,000 total employees). Six firms reported recruiting at more campuses during 1981-82 than in 1980-81, five indicated no change in number of campuses visited, and three indicated a decline from 1980-81 levels.

When asked to indicate the factors considered in determining whether a particular campus was included in campus recruiting, a variety of responses was given (see Table 16), however, the quality of the academic program and of the graduates was listed by all firms.

TABLE 16
FACTORS DETERMINING WHETHER A PARTICULAR CAMPUS IS INCLUDED IN RECRUITING

Factor	Frequency
Quality of program/graduates	15
Proximity of college to major locations	7
Number of graduates	6
Past success recruiting at college	2
Faculty	1
Average G.P.A. (grades not inflated)	1

An attempt was made to determine the extent to which certain terms of a job offer might be negotiable. Table 17 shows the number of firms considering each term negotiable. It would appear that response deadlines for offers and starting date are open for negotiation with most firms (13 of the 15 responding) while location of employment is open with many of those firms operating out of multiple locations.

TABLE 17
NEGOTIABLE TERMS OF A JOB OFFER

Term	Frequency
Deadline for response to offer	13
Starting date	13
Location of employment	7
Starting salary	4

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate the greatest changes noted in college graduates over the past five years. Table 18 summarizes the varied and, in several instances, conflicting responses.

TABLE 18
GREATEST CHANGES IN COLLEGE GRADUATES OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
Greater interest in working (work ethic)	3
Communication skills deteriorating rapidly	2
More "I" oriented	2
Switch to pro-business attitude	2
More knowledgeable about firms	1
More knowledgeable about careers	1
Decreased sense of commitment	1
More idealistic about advancement possibilities	1
Less committed to single employer	1
Generally less well qualified	1

BANKING, FINANCE, AND INSURANCE

Altogether, 65 firms participated in the study by returning completed survey forms. All employer size categories are represented as noted in Table 1.

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
NUMBER RESPONDING	12	18	11	12	7	5	65

RESPONSIBILITY FOR AND ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING

The vast majority of firms (57 of 65) reported that there was a single individual at the corporate level who was responsible for all college relations/recruiting activities. (See Table 2.a below.) Table 2.b reports the various titles employed for that person as reported by respondents, while Table 2.c reports the titles of the individual to whom the college relations/recruiting coordinator reports.

TABLE 2.a
IS THERE A PERSON AT THE CORPORATE LEVEL
RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL COLLEGE RELATIONS/
RECRUITING ACTIVITIES OF YOUR ORGANIZATION?

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
RESPONSE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	11	16	11	8	7	4	57
NO	1	2	0	4	0	1	8
TOTAL	12	18	11	12	7	5	65

TABLE 2.b
TITLE OF PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Manager, College Relations		2		3	1	2	8
Asst. V.P., Personnel		3		1	2		6
Director, Recruiting		3			1		4
Coordinator, College Relations		1	2		1		4
V.P., Personnel		1		1		1	3
Asst. Director, Personnel	2	1					3
Mgr., Personnel	1		1				2
Director, Personnel	2		1				3
Manager, Employment and Recruiting			1	1			2
Personnel Officer	1	1					2
V.P., Development	1						1
Asst. V.P., Training			1				1
Asst. V.P., AA/EEO and Staffing			1				1
Manager, Employment		1					1
Manager, Professional Employment		1					1
Manager, Recruitment					1		1
Manager, Staff Development	1						1
Manager, Employee Relations			1				1

(Continued)

Table 2.b (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Sr. V.P.		1					1
Training Officer	1	1		1			3
Sr. Personnel Asst.		1					1
College Relations Administrator				1			1
Management Development Administrator				1			1
Director, College Marketing			1				1
Employment Representative	1						1
Recruiter			1				1
Educational Relations Coordinator					1		1
Human Relations Officer			1				1
Asst. Director, College Relations				1			1
TOTAL	10	17	11	10	7	3	58

TABLE 2.c
TITLE OF PERSON TO WHOM CORPORATE COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING COORDINATOR REPORTS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
V.P., Personnel	1	3	1	3			8
Director, Human Resources	1			1	3	1	6
V.P., Human Resources			4	1			5
Manager, Employment		1	2		1	1	5
Director, Personnel	2	2	1				5
Executive Director, Personnel		3					3
Executive V.P.	1	1					2
Sr. Personnel Officer		2					2
V.P., Management Recruitment					1	1	2
V.P., Recruiting Services						1	1
V.P., Manager Career Services				1			1
V.P., Manpower Development				1			1
V.P., College Recruiting				1			1
V.P., Director Personnel Relations			1				1
Vice President					1		1
Senior V.P.		1					1
V.P., Administration	1						1
President					1		1
Chief Executive Officer		1					1
Manager, Manpower Development			1				1

(Continued)

Table 2.c (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Manager, College and Professional Recruiting			1				1
Mgr., Personnel	1						1
Manager, Training				1			1
Manager, Corporate Staffing					1		1
Manager, Professional Development	1						1
Director, Administration	1						1
Asst. Director, Personnel		1					1
Asst. V.P., Director Personnel			1				1
TOTAL	9	15	12	9	8	4	57

Respondents were asked to indicate which of three organizational patterns characterized their college relations/recruiting activities: Centralized (all handled at corporate level); Combination (coordinated at corporate level but work carried out at operating unit level); or Decentralized (all handled at operating unit level). Table 2.d reports the results.

TABLE 2.d
ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING FUNCTION

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
ORGANIZATION	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Centralized	8	10	5	6	3	2	34
Combination	4	6	6	3	4	2	25
Decentralized		2		3		1	6
TOTAL	12	18	11	12	7	5	65

With respect to staffing, firms were requested to provide both the number of persons who devote a majority of their time to the college relations/recruiting function and the number who devote a lesser amount of time (e.g., personnel who conduct campus interviews). Tables 2.e and 2.f show the responses. Part-time personnel were about equally drawn from personnel and non-personnel areas.

TABLE 2.e
NUMBER OF PERSONS DEVOTING A MAJORITY OF TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	5	7	4	3			19
1	4	6	3	3	1		17
2	2	3	1	4			10
3	1	2		2	2		7
4					1	1	2
6			1			1	2
7			1				1
8					1		1
10					1		1
11			1				1
15					1		1
16						1	1
50						1	1
TOTAL	12	18	11	12	7	4	64

TABLE 2.f
NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL DEVOTING SOME TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	2	2					4
1	1	1		1			3
2	4	2					6
3		2	1	1			4
4		2	2	1			5
5	1						1
6	1	2					3
7	1	1					2
8	1	1					2
9			1	1			2
10		1		1			2
11		1		1			2
12			1		1		2
15	1		2	1			4
16			1				1
18				1			1
20		1	1	1	1		4
25					1		1
35		1					1
38				1			1
40				1	1		2
50						1	1
52		1					1
67			1				1
75					1	1	2
100					1	2	3
110					1		1
120				1			1
300			1				1
TOTAL	12	18	11	12	7	4	64

EVALUATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Sixty-one firms responded to the question: "Are there criteria by which the performance of your college relations/recruiting program is evaluated?" Thirty-six firms indicated there were performance criteria while 25 indicated there were none. Meeting hiring goals or quotas was most frequently cited (17 firms), followed by offer to acceptance ratio

(11 firms), cost per hire (eight) and retention of recent hires (five). Several firms indicated multiple criteria.

ACTIVITIES UTILIZED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Seventeen different activities associated with college relations/recruiting were listed on the survey and respondents were asked to indicate the activities engaged in by their firm and those considered to be of high priority. (See Table 3.)

Printed recruiting material was provided by all 61 firms responding to this item, followed by cultivating key faculty/staff contacts and participating in campus career days (51 firms each), providing speakers to faculty or student organizations (42 firms), summer hiring of students (38 firms), providing co-op or intern opportunities (37 firms), and cultivating key student contacts (33 firms). Only two activities (cultivating key faculty/staff contacts and printed recruiting material) were judged to be priorities by as many as 25 percent of all firms responding.

TABLE 3
ACTIVITIES NORMALLY USED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Printed recruiting material	10	17 (4)	10 (2)	12 (5)	7 (2)	5 (2)	61 (15)
Audio/visual recruiting material		5 (1)	1	2 (1)	3	1	12 (2)
Cultivating key faculty/staff contacts	8	15 (7)	8 (4)	10 (3)	6	4 (2)	51 (16)
Cultivating key student contacts	4	8 (3)	6 (2)	5	6 (1)	4 (2)	33 (8)
Providing speakers to faculty or student organizations	1	14 (3)	8 (2)	9 (1)	6 (1)	4 (3)	42 (10)
Scholarships or grants awarded to an academic department or institution to support student aid (based on either academic performance or financial need)	2	2	2	1	3	3 (1)	13 (1)
Summer hiring of students	7	6	9 (3)	6 (1)	6	4 (1)	38 (5)
Summer hiring of faculty		1			1	2	4
Participating in campus career days	8	13 (5)	8 (1)	11 (4)	6 (1)	5	51 (11)
Hiring students through co-op, intern or other similar programs sponsored by a campus	3	11 (2)	10 (3)	7 (4)	4 (1)	2	37 (10)

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Conferences or seminars for placement personnel and faculty at your expense	2	4	2	3	2	1	14
Contributions of cash or equipment to selected campuses	2	3	3	3	1	4 (1)	16 (1)
Sponsorship of student or faculty projects, such as research		1	1		1		3
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students at professional conferences		2	1		3	4	10
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students while you are on campus	3	9 (2)	2 (1)	2	3 (2)	3 (1)	22 (6)
Gifts of advertising materials, e.g., pens, lighters, desk accessories, etc.		2	5	1	3	1	12
Advertising through campus newspapers	4	9 (1)	7 (1)	4	4	4	32 (2)

*First number represents frequency of use while number in parentheses represents high priority activity as indicated by respondents.

Another way of examining high priority college relations/recruiting activities was to ask respondents to indicate what they considered to be the single most important thing they could do to assure productive recruiting year in and year out. Clearly, maintaining strong campus contacts and communication was the most frequent response (26 firms). The next most frequently cited were maintaining a highly professional personnel staff (seven firms) and concentrating on key schools (three firms).

Respondents were asked whether they utilized either hiring bonuses or agencies or search firms as part of their recruiting program. Only two firms reported using hiring bonuses and five reported using agencies or search firms (three firms used the latter for management trainees and two for accounting majors). Only two firms indicated that they paid fees for new college graduates.

Surprisingly, less than one-half of the respondents indicated their firm provided formal training for personnel who would be engaged in campus interviewing (26 firms). Four of these firms reported the use of external consultants to provide interviewer training. (See Table 4.)

TABLE 4
FORMAL INTERVIEWER TRAINING PROGRAMS*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	2	3	7	6	5	3	26
NO	10	15	4	6	2	2	39
TOTAL	12	18	11	12	7	5	65

*Of those firms having a formal training program, the programs ran from 3 to 40 hours in length and averaged 9.9 hours. Eight firms indicated they have used external consultants to train staff or to review their college relations/recruiting program.

COST PER NEW GRADUATE HIRED

The average cost (out-of-pocket expense excluding staff salaries) per new graduate hired was reported by 32 firms and ranged from $50 to $6,591 with the median cost at $825. Many firms did not have average cost per new graduate hired figures available.

FREQUENCY OF HIRING QUOTA REVIEW

Altogether, 61 of the responding firms reported their hiring review timetable. The greatest number (25) indicated annual review, 12 indicated quarterly review, three reported monthly, one weekly, and four as needed.

Several questions relating to change in the college relations/recruiting function over time were included in the survey. Tables 5 through 8 report these results.

TABLE 5
GREATEST CHANGES NOTED OVER PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
More competition for top graduates	8
Graduates are better prepared than previously	8
Better communication/understanding between business and colleges	5
Escalating starting salaries/salary compression problem	4
Restrictions in campuses visited	3
Improved pre-screening activities	3

TABLE 6
GREATEST CHANGES TO BE MADE OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
Increased competition for top graduates	8
Becoming more cost-effective	5
Employers will become more selective	4
Need to develop better selection criteria	4
Need to become more sensitive to campus mood/needs	4
Continued salary escalation/compression	3
Continued improvement in pre-screening methods	3

TABLE 7
GREATEST PROBLEM (OTHER THAN ECONOMY) FACING EMPLOYERS OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
Increased recruiting/hiring costs	13
Shortages of technical graduates	6
Shortages of "qualified" graduates	5
Too many graduates for available jobs	5
Shortages of minority graduates	4
Finding right "mix" of technical and general skills	2
Providing long-term career advancement opportunities	1
Maintaining necessary campus contacts	1
Small to medium size employers attracting top graduates	1

TABLE 8
HAS YOUR ORGANIZATION HAD TO MAKE ANY DRASTIC CHANGES DUE TO THE CONDITIONS OF THE JOB MARKET OR DUE TO CHANGES IN RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATES?

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
RESPONSE*	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	2	6	8	6	4	2	28
NO	9	11	3	5	3	3	34
TOTAL	11	17	11	11	7	5	62

*Changes Made	Frequency
More thorough screening	11
Escalate salaries/salary compression	6
Reduce campus visits/new hiring	6
Reduce costs	2
Reduce internships	1
Hiring freeze	1
Developed college relations function	1
Offer hiring bonus	1

It is difficult to identify trends from among the diverse and conflicting responses. It does, however, appear that some employers anticipate continued competition for top graduates and increased costs of recruiting and hiring those individuals. On the other hand, some employers anticipate a "buyers" market which will mean more rigorous screening of candidates and fewer hires from among the graduates available.

VOLUME OF RECRUITING ACTIVITY REPORTED

Table 9 reports the number of recent college graduates hired by reporting firms for the 1981-82 recruiting year from all sources, campus and non-campus.

TABLE 9
RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATE HIRES DURING 1981-82 RECRUITING YEAR

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
RANGE	0-27	2-52	0-104	9-94	11-250	100-300
AVERAGE NUMBER	10.2	17.2	36.6	41.5	137.9	217.8

In addition, firms were asked to indicate the percent of hires made from both campus and non-campus sources. Responses were not consistently reported and results could not be reported. The vast majority of candidates did come from campus sources, however, as determined from comparing Tables 9 (total new college hires--all sources) and 15 (total hires from campus recruiting).

Tables 10 through 15 report campus recruiting activity (number of campuses visited, number of campus interviews conducted, number of candidates invited for second interviews, acceptances of invitation for second interview, employment offers made, and acceptances).

TABLE 10
NUMBER OF CAMPUSES VISITED FOR RECRUITING PURPOSES

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
CAMPUSES VISITED	0-22	4-30	0-40	7-99	6-53	30-75
AVERAGE	5.9	12.1	17.2	25.1	29.0	52.3

TABLE 11
NUMBER OF CANDIDATES INTERVIEWED DURING RECRUITING VISITS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INTERVIEWS	0-330	65-572	0-1,819	96-960	150-3,000	340-4,500
AVERAGE	119.4	245.7	390.5	393.5	1,332.5	2,134

TABLE 12
CANDIDATES INVITED FOR SECOND INTERVIEWS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INVITATIONS	0-71	10-146	0-788	11-274	25-622	82-1,250
AVERAGE	21.8	56.4	87.6	102.9	290.3	566.0

TABLE 13
CANDIDATES ACCEPTING INVITATION FOR SECOND INTERVIEW

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
ACCEPTANCES	2-71	5-140	0-342	10-262	25-550	62-1,195
AVERAGE	20.9	50.7	71.7	94.9	243.4	505.6

TABLE 14
OFFERS OF EMPLOYMENT

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
OFFERS	0-42	9-60	0-134	8-166	15-300	28-435
AVERAGE	12.0	26.1	28.2	51.9	98.3	178.5

TABLE 15
HIRES RESULTING FROM CAMPUS RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
HIRES	0-29	1-35	0-78	8-137	11-200	17-300
AVERAGE	7.8	14.7	18.1	35.4	76.7	115.5

These tables provide average figures which represent the experience of more than 60 firms in the banking, finance, and insurance fields for the 1981-82 recruiting year. Eighteen employers reported that 1981-82 hires increased over 1980-81 (eight to 200 percent with a median gain of 30 percent), 16 reported no change, and 17 reported a decline in hiring (one to 80 percent down with a median decline of 29 percent). Fewer firms reported a comparison of 1981-82 hires with the average of the previous five years, however, of those who did, 21 reported an increase (one to 500 percent with the median at 22 percent), six reported no change, and 12 reported a decline (two to 54 percent with the median decline at 40 percent). Twenty-one firms reported visiting fewer campuses during 1981-82 while 41 reported visiting the same number or more.

Employers were asked to indicate the factors determining whether a particular campus was included in campus recruiting. Responses are noted in Table 16.

TABLE 16
FACTORS DETERMINING WHETHER A PARTICULAR CAMPUS IS INCLUDED IN RECRUITING

Factor	Frequency
Quality of program/graduates	29
Proximity of college to major locations	27
Past success recruiting at college	27
School offers majors sought	16
Success of previous graduates hired	11
Helpfulness/interest/competency of placement staff	8
Number of graduates	3
Interest of graduates in firm	3
Number of minority candidates available	3
Graduates' willingness to relocate	1
Accreditation of business school	1

Employers were surveyed to determine whether terms of a job offer were negotiable. Table 17 shows the number of firms considering each term negotiable. Clearly, starting dates and deadline for response to offers are considered negotiable by most firms (61 and 56 respectively).

TABLE 17
NEGOTIABLE TERMS OF A JOB OFFER

Term	Frequency
Starting date	61
Deadline for response to offer	56
Starting salary	15
Location of employment	10

Finally, firms were asked to indicate the greatest changes noted in college graduates over the past five years. Table 18 presents the results.

TABLE 18
GREATEST CHANGES IN COLLEGE GRADUATES
OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
Graduates more directed/career minded	19
Graduates more demanding/less realistic	8
Expectations for career opportunities and salary greater than previously	5
Graduates more mature/serious	7
More positive attitudes toward business	4
More open to consider a variety of career alternatives	2
More sophisticated	2
Speaking/writing skills deteriorated	2
Interviewing skills improved	2
More business and experienced graduates available	2
Graduates too specialized	2
More willingness to relocate	1
Stronger work ethic	1
Graduates better able to make transition	1

MERCHANDISING (RETAIL AND WHOLESALE) AND SERVICES

Thirty-seven firms in the merchandising area returned completed survey forms. Table 1 presents the number of firms participating by size (number of employees).

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
NUMBER RESPONDING	3	6	10	6	5	7	37

RESPONSIBILITY FOR AND ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING

Twenty-eight of the firms responding indicated there was a person at the corporate level responsible for all college relations and recruiting activities. (See Table 2.a.) Table 2.b presents the wide range of titles reported for the person holding that position. Years of tenure ranged from two months to 20 years with the average being four years.

TABLE 2.a
IS THERE A PERSON AT THE CORPORATE LEVEL
RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL COLLEGE RELATIONS/
RECRUITING ACTIVITIES OF YOUR ORGANIZATION?

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
RESPONSE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	1	6	8	4	4	5	28
NO	2	0	2	2	1	1	8
TOTAL	3	6	10	6	5	6	36

TABLE 2.b
TITLE OF PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Manager, College Relations			1	1	1	1	4
Manager, Recruiting				1		2	3
Director, Recruiting		1			1		2
Director, Personnel	1					1	2
Corporate Manager, Personnel		1					1
Corporate Manger, Staffing					1		1
Manager, Exec. Development				1			1
Manager, Personnel Administration				1			1
Manager, Exec. Recruiting						1	1
Manager, Exec. Resource Planning			1				1
Manager, Jr. Exec. Placement			1				1
Manager, Employee Development			1				1
Manager, Employment Recruiting		1					1
Director, Management Training						1	1
Director, Exec. Development			1				1
Asst. Director, College Relations			1				1
Asst. Director, Exec. Placement			1				1

(Continued)

Table 2.b (Continued)

TITLE	SIZE (Number of Employees) Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
V.P., Employee Relations			1				1
Personnel Administrator		1					1
Supervisor, Salaried Personnel		1					1
TOTAL	1	5	8	4	3	6	27

Table 2.c shows the titles of the person to whom the corporate college relations/recruiting coordinator reports. Titles vary considerably and no particular pattern of reporting seems to be apparent.

TABLE 2.c
TITLE OF PERSON TO WHOM CORPORATE COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING COORDINATOR REPORTS

TITLE	SIZE (Number of Employees) Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Senior V.P.		2	1	1		1	5
V.P., Personnel		1			1	1	3
Director, Personnel				1		1	2
Director, Exec. Development			2				2
V.P., Exec. Development					1		1
V.P., Exec. Recruiting			1				1
V.P., Organization Planning and Development					1		1
V.P., Finance and Administration				1			1
Exec. V.P.	1						1
President			1				1

(Continued)

Table 2.c (Continued)

TITLE	SIZE (Number of Employees) Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501 5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Exec. Director, Human Resources		1					1
Director, Exec. Recruiting						1	1
Director, Corporate Staffing and Development					1		1
Director, Training				1			1
Director, Exec. Placement			1				1
Asst. Director, Human Resources			1				1
Mgr., Personnel		1					1
Mgr., Selection and Placement						1	1
TOTAL	1	5	7	4	4	5	26

The majority of firms responding to the survey reported a centralized organizational pattern for college relations and recruiting (all handled at the corporate level). Nine firms reported a combination pattern (coordination at corporate level but work carried out at operating unit level), and three firms reported a decentralized organization pattern. Table 2.d presents the complete results by size of firm.

TABLE 2.d
ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING FUNCTION

ORGANIZATION*	SIZE (Number of Employees) Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Centralized	0	5	6	5	2	3	21
Combination	1	1	1	1	2	3	9
Decentralized	1	0	2	0	0	0	3
TOTAL	2	6	9	6	4	6	33

*Two firms reported no active formal program.

In terms of staffing for college relations/recruiting, firms were asked to indicate both the number of persons devoting a majority of their time to the function and the number who devote a lesser amount of time (e.g., personnel who conduct campus interviews). Tables 2.e and 2.f report these results. Smaller firms were less likely to have staff devoting a majority of their time to college relations/recruiting and all firms drew part-time recruiting assistance almost equally from personnel and non-personnel functions.

TABLE 2.e
NUMBER OF PERSONS DEVOTING A MAJORITY OF TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	2	2	1		1	2	8
1		1	2	4	1		8
2		2	2	2	2	1	9
3			1		1	1	3
4		1	1				2
12						1	1
TOTAL	2	6	7	6	5	5	31

TABLE 2.f
NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL DEVOTING SOME TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0					1	1	2
1	1		1				2
2			1	1			2
3		1					1
5		1	1		1		3
6	1			1			2
7		1	1				2
9				1			1
10			1		1		2
11			1				1

(Continued)

Table 2.f (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
12				1		1	2
13				1			1
15			2				2
20					1		1
25						1	1
38						1	1
50		1			1		2
175						1	1
300						1	1
TOTAL	2	4	8	5	5	6	30

EVALUATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Twenty-one of the responding firms indicated there were formal criteria used for evaluating the performance of their college relations/recruiting program while 11 indicated there were no formal criteria. Of the criteria cited (some firms listed multiple criteria), the number of hires or meeting hiring goals or quotas was listed by 13 firms, the quality of candidates hired by nine, retention rate by three and cost per hire by two. Offer to acceptance ratio, candidate feedback, and meeting EEO goals were each cited once as performance criteria for a firm.

ACTIVITIES UTILIZED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Seventeen different activities normally associated with college relations and recruiting were listed on the survey form and respondents were asked to indicate those engaged in by their firm and those considered to be a high priority. Table 3 reports the findings.

Printed recruiting material (31 firms), hiring co-op students or interns (28 firms), cultivating key faculty/staff contacts (27 firms), participating in campus career days (26 firms), and providing speakers to faculty or student organizations (24 firms) were clearly the activities most frequently engaged in while cultivating key faculty/staff contacts (18 firms) and providing printed recruiting material (14 firms) were the activities judged by the most firms to be of high priority.

TABLE 3
ACTIVITIES NORMALLY USED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Printed recruiting material	1 (1)	5 (2)	9 (3)	6 (4)	4 (2)	6 (2)	31 (14)
AV recruiting material	1 (1)	1	3 (1)	5 (2)	4	3	17 (4)
Cultivating key faculty/staff contacts	2 (1)	3 (3)	7 (4)	6 (5)	4 (3)	5 (2)	27 (18)
Cultivating key student contacts		1	5 (3)	4	3 (1)	2	15 (4)
Providing speakers to faculty or student organizations	2 (1)	2	6 (2)	5 (1)	4 (1)	5 (1)	24 (6)
Scholarships or grants awarded to an academic dept. or institution to support student aid (based on either academic performance or or financial need)		1 (1)		3 (1)	2	2 (1)	8 (3)
Summer hiring of students	1 (1)	3	6	3	2	4	19 (1)
Summer hiring of faculty				1			1
Participating in campus career days	1 (1)	4 (1)	8	5 (3)	3	5	26 (5)
Hiring students through co-op, intern or other similar programs sponsored by a campus	2 (1)	4 (1)	7 (2)	6	4 (1)	5	28 (5)

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Conferences or seminars for placement personnel and faculty at your expense		1	2 (1)	2	2 (1)		7 (2)
Contributions of cash or equipment to selected campuses		2 (1)	2	2	1	1 (1)	8 (2)
Sponsorship of student or faculty projects, such as research			1			1	2
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students at professional conferences			2	3	2	1	8
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students while you are on campus	1 (1)	1 (1)	4	2	2 (1)	1	11 (3)
Gifts of advertising materials, e.g., pens, lighters, desk accessories, etc.			1	3 (1)		2	6 (1)
Advertising through campus newspapers	2 (1)	2 (1)	1	2	1	3	11 (2)

*First number represents frequency of use while number in parentheses represents high priority activity as indicated by respondents.

Firms were also asked to indicate what they considered to be the single most important thing they could do to assure productive recruiting year in and year out. Eighteen firms indicated that maintaining high visibility or good communications with campuses was most important. No other single response was cited by more than four firms.

Those surveyed were asked if they utilized either hiring bonuses or employment agencies or search firms. Three firms reported the use of hiring bonuses (one firm indicated bonuses were used for new graduates with prior related experience) and one reported the use of agencies for new graduates.

Concerning the use of external consultants to review college relations/recruiting operations or to train staff, only five firms reported the use of such consultants. A majority of responding firms (22) did not even report the use of a formal training program for their interviewers. (See Table 4.)

TABLE 4
FORMAL INTERVIEWER TRAINING PROGRAMS*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
PROGRAM	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	1	1	5	2	1	2	12
NO	1	5	4	4	4	4	22
TOTAL	2	6	9	6	5	6	34

*Of those employers reporting a formal training program, the training lasted from two to 64 hours with the average length being 16.3 hours. Two of the larger firms reported training programs lasting 12 and 14 weeks, however, it was not possible to ascertain whether matters other than interviewing were included--presumably these longer programs covered other personnel matters. Five firms reported using external consultants for training staff or for reviewing their college relations/recruiting program.

COST PER NEW GRADUATE HIRED

Twenty-three firms reported recruiting costs ranging from $128 to $3,620 per new hire with the median cost at $500.

FREQUENCY OF HIRING QUOTA REVIEW

Twenty-seven firms reported review of hiring quotas with annual review (11) most frequently cited. Seven firms reported quarterly review, five semi-annually, and four monthly.

Tables 5 through 8 report the responses to several items relating to change in the college relations/recruiting function over time.

TABLE 5
GREATEST CHANGES NOTED OVER PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
Placement more professional/helpful	4
Students have better career exposure	3
Employers can be more selective	3
Improved methods for scheduling interviews	3
Improved contacts between colleges and employers	3
Expectations of graduates too high	2
Recruiters better trained	1
Students better prepared to market themselves	1
Improved employer training for new graduates	1

TABLE 6
GREATEST CHANGES TO BE MADE OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
Employers will become more selective in their recruiting (grads and colleges)	8
More co-op/internship programs	3
Greater competition for top graduates	2
Providing challenge to top candidates in retailing	2
Developing more cost-effective recruiting	1
Appealing to women technical graduates	1
Decline in total number of graduates	1
Maintaining strong ties with key colleges	1

TABLE 7
GREATEST PROBLEM (OTHER THAN ECONOMY) FACING EMPLOYERS OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Problem	Frequency
Unrealistic student expectations	3
Increased competition for top graduates	3
Escalation in starting salaries/salary compression	3
Employee retention/career pathing	2
Recruiting qualified minorities	1
Effective utilization of "average" students	1
Fewer jobs available for graduates	1
Cost-effectiveness	1
Keeping candidates using placement offices	1
Oversupply of MBAs and their unrealistic expectations	1
Placement support of retailing careers	1

TABLE 8
HAS YOUR ORGANIZATION HAD TO MAKE ANY DRASTIC CHANGES DUE TO THE CONDITIONS OF THE JOB MARKET OR DUE TO CHANGES IN RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATES?

Response*	Frequency
YES	10
NO	22

*Changes Made	Frequency
Escalate starting salaries	6
More thorough screening	5
Become more competitive on campus	1
Expand career options	1

VOLUME OF RECRUITING ACTIVITY REPORTED

Table 9 reports the number of recent college graduate hires made by recruiting firms from all sources (campus and non-campus) during the 1981-82 recruiting year.

TABLE 9
RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATE HIRES DURING 1981-82 RECRUITING YEAR

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
RANGE	1-5	1-56	10-150	27-75	10-260	20-300
AVERAGE	3	16	52.5	45	91.5	163.8

Firms were also asked to indicate the percent of hires from both campus and non-campus sources, however, responses were inconsistent and results could not be reported. The majority of new college graduate hires did result from campus recruiting, however. (Comparison of Tables 9 and 15.)

Tables 10 through 15 report campus recruiting activity (numbers of campuses visited, number of campus interviews conducted, number of candidates invited for second interviews, acceptance of invitation for second interview, employment offers, and acceptances).

TABLE 10
NUMBER OF CAMPUSES VISITED FOR RECRUITING PURPOSES

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
CAMPUSES VISITED	3-12	1-26	9-26	13-48	15-56	12-150
AVERAGE	7.5	8.8	17.4	21.6	33.3	63.6

TABLE 11
NUMBER OF CANDIDATES INTERVIEWED DURING RECRUITING VISITS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INTERVIEWS	30-188	9-897	79-1,034	150-769	240-1,800	100-3,442
AVERAGE	109	357.8	519.3	465.4	927.5	1,410.4

TABLE 12
CANDIDATES INVITED FOR SECOND INTERVIEWS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INVITATIONS	6-28	6-281	14-386	40-130	58-680	13-500
AVERAGE	17	100.2	122.4	90.4	279.5	297

TABLE 13
CANDIDATES ACCEPTING INVITATION FOR SECOND INTERVIEW

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
ACCEPTANCES	6-23	3-251	10-375	30-125	38-520	13-400
AVERAGE	11.5	91.8	98.1	79.6	206	249.5

TABLE 14
OFFERS OF EMPLOYMENT

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
OFFERS	6-23	1-69	12-167	32-77	16-370	10-346
AVERAGE	14.5	27.6	49.8	44.6	135	199

TABLE 15
HIRES RESULTING FROM CAMPUS RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
HIRES	1-5	1-38	6-107	25-35	6-259	10-243
AVERAGE	3	15.2	33.1	28.8	89.8	141.8

These tables provide figures which represent the combined experience of 32 firms of various size in college recruiting during the 1981-82 recruiting year. Altogether, 13 of these firms reported increased hiring over 1980-81 of from five to 200 percent, seven reported no change, and 10 reported declines ranging from three to 50 percent. Compared to the average number of hires over the last five years, eight firms reported a decrease in 1981-82 while 11 reported an increase and four reported no change. Fourteen firms reported that they recruited at more campuses in 1981-82 and 12 reported a decline in the number of campuses visited.

Three factors emerge as primary considerations in determining whether a particular campus is included in the recruiting efforts of firms. Quality of the program and/or graduates (16 firms), past recruiting success at the particular campus (15 firms) and proximity of the campus to major operations (12 firms) were most frequently cited. A variety of other factors were also listed. All results are reported in Table 16.

TABLE 16
FACTORS DETERMINING WHETHER A PARTICULAR CAMPUS IS INCLUDED IN RECRUITING

Factor	Frequency
Quality of program/graduates	16
Past recruiting successes at campus	15
Proximity of college to major locations	12
Helpfulness of placement staff	5
Majors offered	4
Number of graduates	3
Cost to recruit at school	2
Student response to organization	2
Student work ethic	1
Faculty contacts	1

An attempt was made to determine the extent to which certain terms of a job offer might be negotiable. Table 17 shows the results.

TABLE 17
NEGOTIABLE TERMS OF A JOB OFFER

Term	Frequency
Starting date	28
Deadline for response to offer	26
Location of employment	8
Starting salary	5

Finally, Table 18 reports the greatest changes in college graduates noted over the past five years. Responses are varied but for the most part are positive in terms of changes noted.

TABLE 18
GREATEST CHANGES IN COLLEGE GRADUATES OVER PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
More realistic about job and career	9
Better prepared for the job search	5
Better prepared for work	3
Salary expectations unrealistic	2
Increased expectations of employers	2
Less realistic about job and career	1
Lack career direction	1
More experienced graduates available	1
Greater willingness to relocate	1
Stronger work ethic	1
Graduates more serious	1
Lower academic standards	1
More concern about training programs	1

AEROSPACE, ELECTRONICS, AND INSTRUMENTS

Eighty-eight firms in the aerospace, electronics, and instruments industries returned completed survey forms. All size categories are represented. (See Table 1.)

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
NUMBER RESPONDING	11	18	19	12	8	20	88

RESPONSIBILITY FOR AND ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING

Sixty-seven of the 87 firms responding to this item reported that there was a person at the corporate level responsible for all college relations/recruiting activities while 20 reported that there was no such person at the corporate level. (See Table 2.a.) Titles of that corporate staff member varied considerably from firm to firm (see Table 2.b) as did years of tenure in that position which ranged from a few months to 17 years. The median experience level was, however, only two years in the position and few had more than three years in the position.

TABLE 2.a
IS THERE A PERSON AT THE CORPORATE LEVEL RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL COLLEGE RELATIONS/ RECRUITING ACTIVITIES OF YOUR ORGANIZATION?

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
RESPONSE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	9	16	14	7	7	14	67
NO	2	2	5	4	1	6	20
TOTAL	11	18	19	11	8	20	87

TABLE 2.b
TITLE OF PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Manager, College Relations		1	5	2	4	12	24
Manager, Employment		3	2	1		1	7
Manager, Employee Relations			2	1	3		6
Manager, Recruiting and Professional Placement			1			2	3
Manager, Organizational Staffing		1					1
Manager, Professional Staffing		2		1			3
Manager, Staffing	1			1			2
Supervisor, Employment		2	1				3
Supervisor, Personnel Development		1					1
Sr. Human Resources Representative		1	1				2
Sr. Technical Recruiter				1			1
Sr. Personnel Representative	1						1
Director, Personnel	2						2
Director, College Relations	1						1
Corporate Director, Employee Development		2					2
V.P. for Administration		1					1

(Continued)

Table 2.b (Continued)

TITLE	SIZE (Number of Employees) Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501 5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Professional Employment Representative		1	3				4
Personnel Administrator	1						1
Employment Administrator	1						1
Employment Representative	1						1
Employment Specialist				1			1
TOTAL	8	15	15	8	7	15	68

Table 2.c lists the titles of the person to whom the corporate college relations/recruiting coordinator reports.

TABLE 2.c
TITLE OF PERSON TO WHOM CORPORATE COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING COORDINATOR REPORTS

TITLE	SIZE (Number of Employees) Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Director, Personnel	2	2	2		1	2	9
Manager, Employment			4	3	1	1	9
V.P., Human Resources	1	2	1		1	3	8
Mgr., Personnel	3	1	1	1	1		7
V.P., Industrial Relations	1	1	1				3
Director, Human Resources		2			1		3
President	2						2
V.P., Personnel		1			1		2
Manager, Recruiting		1				1	2

(Continued)

Table 2.c (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Asst. Director, Personnel		2					2
Manager, Organizational Development		1					1
Mgr., Engineering Services			1				1
Mgr., Employee Relations			1				1
Manager, Technical Placement				1			1
Mgr., Planning and Staffing				1			1
V.P., Employee Relations						1	1
V.P., Organization and Management Resources						1	1
V.P., Development and Placement						1	1
Asst. V.P., Human Resources			1				1
Director, Employee Relations		1					1
Director, Engineering				1			1
Corporate Mgr., Selection and Placement						1	1
Corporate Mgr., Employment Programs						1	1
Corporate Staffing Mgr.						1	1
Director, Exec. and Professional Placement						1	1
Chairman			1				1
TOTAL	9	14	13	7	6	14	63

The responding firms indicated which of these three organizational patterns best described their college relations and recruiting activities: Centralized (all handled at the corporate level); Combination (coordinated at the corporate level but work carried out at operating unit level); or, Decentralized (all handled at operating unit level). Table 2.d shows that those firms employing more than 10,000 are more likely to follow a combination pattern while firms with less than 10,000 employees are more likely to follow a centralized pattern of organization.

TABLE 2.d
ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING FUNCTION

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
ORGANIZATION	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Centralized	7	9	7	8	1		32
Combination	1	7	9	2	4	17	40
Decentralized	3	2	3	2	3	3	16
TOTAL	11	18	19	12	8	20	88

In terms of staffing for college relations/recruiting, firms were asked to indicate both the number of persons devoting a majority of their time to the function and the number who devote a lesser amount of time (e.g., personnel who conduct campus interviews). Tables 2.e and 2.f show the responses and point out the direct relationship between personnel involved and size of firm. In nearly all cases, a majority of the part-time personnel drawn upon came from areas other than personnel.

TABLE 2.e
NUMBER OF PERSONS DEVOTING A MAJORITY OF TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	3	5	4	1	3	1	17
1	8	9	11	3	1	2	34
2		3	2	3	1	1	10
3		1	1	1	1	2	6
4			1				1
5						1	1
6				2		2	4
7						1	1
8						3	3
10						1	1
11						1	1
15						1	1
18						1	1
20					1		1
24						1	1
57						1	1
TOTAL	11	18	19	10	7	19	84

TABLE 2.f
NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL DEVOTING SOME TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	3	1					4
1		3	1				4
2	2	2	2				6
3		1	1	1	1		4
4	2	2	2				6
5	1		5				6
6	2	1		1	1		5
9				1			1
10		2					2
13		1					1

(Continued)

Table 2.f (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
15			1	1	1		3
17				2			2
18					1		1
20		1	1			1	3
23				1			1
25	1	2					3
28			1			1	2
30			2			3	5
35						1	1
40				1	1		2
45			1			1	2
46		1					1
50		1	1	1		1	4
60						1	1
70						1	1
75						1	1
100				1	1		2
130						1	1
150						1	1
200						1	1
250					1	1	2
272						1	1
300						1	1
Over 300					1	2	3
TOTAL	11	18	18	10	8	19	84

EVALUATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

All firms were asked: "Are there criteria by which the performance of your college relations/recruiting program is evaluated?" Sixty-six firms responded affirmatively and 22 indicated no performance criteria. A number of firms listed multiple performance criteria, however, nearly all listed meeting hiring goals/quotas or maintaining a strong offer to hire ratio (60 firms). Cost per hire was cited by 21 firms, quality of candidates hired was cited by 18 firms, six listed retention of recent hires, and five listed meeting affirmative action/EEO goals.

ACTIVITIES UTILIZED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Seventeen different activities associated with college relations/recruiting were listed on the survey form and respondents were asked to indicate the activities their firms engaged in and those which were considered high priority. Table 3 reports the findings. The most popular activities among aerospace, electronics, and instruments firms were the utilization of printed recruiting material (85 firms), cultivating key faculty/staff contacts (79 firms), summer hiring of students (78 firms), participating in campus career days and hiring students through co-op or intern programs (68 firms each), providing speakers to faculty or student organizations (65 firms), contributions of cash or equipment to selected campuses (51 firms), and cultivating key student contacts (49 firms).

Few activities were judged a high priority as only cultivating key faculty/staff contacts and providing printed recruiting material (23 and 21 firms respectively) drew more than 20 responses from the 88 companies participating in the survey.

TABLE 3
ACTIVITIES NORMALLY USED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
ACTIVITY	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Printed recruiting material	10	18 (2)	18 (4)	11 (5)	8 (3)	20 (7)	85 (21)
Audio/visual recruiting material	2	5	7	5 (2)		15 (1)	34 (3)
Cultivating key faculty/staff contacts	9 (3)	16 (2)	16 (3)	11 (5)	7 (3)	20 (7)	79 (23)
Cultivating key student contacts	4 (1)	9	9 (2)	8 (3)	3	16 (1)	49 (7)
Providing speakers to faculty or student organizations	4	13	14 (4)	9 (4)	6	19 (1)	65 (9)
Scholarships or grants awarded to an academic department or institution to support student aid (based on either academic performance of financial need)		7	7 (1)	2	2	15 (3)	33 (4)
Summer hiring of students	11 (2)	16 (3)	16 (2)	9 (2)	6	20 (3)	78 (12)
Summer hiring of faculty	3 (1)	3	5 (1)	3	3	12	29 (2)
Participating in campus career days	7 (1)	16 (1)	15 (1)	7 (2)	6	17 (1)	68 (6)
Hiring students through co-op, intern or other similar programs sponsored by a campus	5 (2)	15 (3)	14 (3)	9 (3)	6 (2)	19 (3)	68 (16)

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Conferences or seminars for placement personnel and faculty at your expense	2	1	5 (1)	5 (2)		7	20 (3)
Contributions of cash or equipment to selected campuses	3	8	8 (1)	6	7 (2)	19 (2)	51 (5)
Sponsorship of student or faculty projects, such as research		2	3	3 (2)	5	9	22 (2)
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students at professional conferences	1	1	4	2	1	7 (1)	16 (1)
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students while you are on campus		5	7	6 (1)	4 (1)	12	34 (2)
Gifts of advertising materials, e.g., pens, lighters, desk accessories, etc.	1	2	3	4 (1)	4	8	22 (1)
Advertising through campus newspapers	5	7	7	3 (2)	6	15 (1)	43 (3)

*First number represents frequency of use while number in parentheses represents high priority activity as indicated by respondents.

Another way of identifying high priority activities was to ask firms to indicate the single most important thing they could do to assure productive recruiting year in and year out. Fifty of the 74 firms providing a response to this item indicated that the most important thing was to maintain close contact and communicate regularly with campuses. No other items were listed by more than four firms.

The survey asked firms whether they offered hiring bonuses or other incentives to new college graduates. Seven of the 82 respondents indicated they offered such hiring incentives to engineering or other technical graduates or on a candidate-by-candidate basis.

Similarly, firms were also asked whether they utilized employment agencies or search firms in hiring new graduates. Only two of 83 firms reported such use for engineering or on an as-needed basis. Only one firm indicated they would pay fees for new graduates hired in this fashion.

Employers were next asked whether they utilized external consultants to review their college relations/recruiting program or to train staff. Ten firms reported they use such consultants while 78 indicated they do not. Forty-four firms reported that they have a formal training program for personnel who would be engaged in campus recruiting, while 43 firms had no such formal training available. (See Table 4.)

TABLE 4
FORMAL INTERVIEWER TRAINING PROGRAMS*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
PROGRAM	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	1	8	5	10	5	15	44
NO	10	10	14	1	3	5	43
TOTAL	11	18	19	11	8	20	87

*Of those having a formal training program, the programs were reported to last from one to 40 hours with the average length of 8.6 hours. One firm reported its training program lasted 15 months, but this undoubtedly covers more than interviewing.

COST PER NEW GRADUATE HIRED

The average cost (out-of-pocket expense excluding salaries of staff) per new graduate hired was reported by 49 of the responding firms. Average costs varied considerably with a range of from $100 to $7,000 per new hire. The median cost per hire was $1,300.

FREQUENCY OF HIRING QUOTA REVIEW

Eighty-one firms reported the frequency with which they reviewed their hiring quotas. Thirty-one did so annually; five reviewed semi-annually; 23 quarterly; nine monthly, and three weekly. Eight firms reported reviewing quotas as needed and two reviewed three times per year.

Several items relating to change in the college relations/recruiting function over time were included in the survey. Tables 5 through 8 report the results.

TABLE 5
GREATEST CHANGES NOTED OVER PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
Greater demand for technical graduates	21
Rising starting salaries/salary compression	10
Students are better prepared, more mature	8
Better cooperation between companies and placement	8
Decline in number of technical graduates available	5
Professionalism of recruiting personnel	4
Better communication between campuses and employers	3
More prerecruiting activities	2
More preselection allowed	2

TABLE 6
GREATEST CHANGES TO BE MADE OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
More cooperation between campuses and employers and/or employer support for campuses	19
Need to become more cost-effective	8
Need more computer/electronic systems used in interviewing, information and tracking candidates	6
Need more professional/committed recruiting personnel	6
Better, more accurate methods for forecasting needs	4
Meeting technical personnel needs	4
Adjusting to decline in personnel needs	4
Smaller firms must become more competitive	3
More schools need to move to preselection	3
Attracting more minorities and women	2
Salary compression problem must be dealt with	2
Need to better utilize non-technical grads	2

TABLE 7
GREATEST PROBLEM (OTHER THAN ECONOMY) FACING EMPLOYERS OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Problem	Frequency
Continuing competition for technical graduates	27
Decline in number of technical graduates	5
Unrealistic expectations of graduates	4
Inability to forecast manpower needs	4
Maintaining relationships with colleges	3
Dealing with salary compression	2
Remaining cost-effective	2
Need to professionalize recruiting personnel	2
Determining how to better utilize non-technical graduates	2

TABLE 8
HAS YOUR ORGANIZATION HAD TO MAKE ANY DRASTIC CHANGES DUE TO THE CONDITIONS OF THE JOB MARKET OR DUE TO CHANGES IN RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATES?

Response*	Frequency
YES	29
NO	49

*Changes Made	Frequency
Escalate starting salaries	21
Relocate facilities	3
Reduce/cancel recruiting	3
Fewer hires	2
Fewer interns	1
Offer hiring bonuses	1
More thorough screening	1
Become more aggressive	1
Be more flexible in starting assignment	1

VOLUME OF RECRUITING ACTIVITY REPORTED

Table 9 presents the number of recent college graduate hires made by participating firms from all sources (campus and non-campus) during the 1981-82 recruiting year.

TABLE 9
RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATE HIRES DURING 1981-82 RECRUITING YEAR

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
RANGE	0-26	0-65	0-85	1-155	0-450	59-1,100
AVERAGE	7	22	30	53	123	423

Firms were additionally asked to indicate the percent of hires from both campus and non-campus sources, however, responses were not consistent and results could not be reported. However, by comparing Tables 9 and 15, it is apparent that the vast majority of new college graduates were hired as the result of campus recruiting.

Tables 10 through 15 report campus recruiting activity (number of campuses visited, number of interviews conducted, number of candidates invited for a second interview, acceptance of invitation for second interview, employment offers, and acceptances).

TABLE 10
NUMBER OF CAMPUSES VISITED FOR RECRUITING PURPOSES

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
CAMPUSES VISITED	2-25	3-64	2-90	8-75	29-97	20-437
AVERAGE	7	17.5	21.8	30.9	58	125.3

TABLE 11
NUMBER OF CANDIDATES INTERVIEWED DURING RECRUITING VISITS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INTERVIEWS	60-181	12-918	30 - 1,283	109-2,000	600-4,875	388-20,000
AVERAGE	102	318	476	677	2,001	5,078

TABLE 12
CANDIDATES INVITED FOR SECOND INTERVIEWS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INVITATIONS	5-75	1-321	2-215	10-450	170-1,286	197-2,000
AVERAGE	23	74	80	183	547	913

TABLE 13
CANDIDATES ACCEPTING INVITATION FOR SECOND INTERVIEW

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
ACCEPTANCES	5-53	1-222	2-190	10-400	150-992	158-1,950
AVERAGE	19	60	71	124	381	715

TABLE 14
OFFERS OF EMPLOYMENT

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
OFFERS	1-33	1-137	1-128	10-250	42-363	45-1,769
AVERAGE	10	30	44	99	167	653

TABLE 15
HIRES RESULTING FROM CAMPUS RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
HIRES	1-26	1-65	0-64	0-155	40-210	36-1,100
AVERAGE	6	18	23	49	95	307

These tables provide average figures which represent the experience of participating firms in the aerospace, electronics, and instruments fields during the 1981-82 recruiting year. Thirty-five firms reported that hiring during 1981-82 was up over 1980-81 (three to 250 percent with a median of +22 percent), 16 firms reported no change and 25 reported a decline (-10 to -100 percent with the median decline of -28 percent). Further, 56 firms reported a comparison of 1981-82 hires with the average number of hires over the previous five years. Thirty-one reported increases (one to 500 percent with the median gain at 25 percent), 10 reported no change, and 15 reported declines (10 to 100 percent with the median decline at 25 percent).

When asked to indicate the factors considered in determining whether a particular campus was included in campus recruiting, the firms provided a variety of responses. There was considerable agreement on four factors however: campus offers majors sought--usually technical (50 firms); quality of the academic program and/or graduates (42 firms); prior success recruiting at the campus (41 firms); and geographic location of the campus/proximity to major locations (39 firms). Table 16 presents the results.

TABLE 16
FACTORS DETERMINING WHETHER A PARTICULAR CAMPUS IS INCLUDED IN RECRUITING

Factor	Frequency
Offers majors sought (usually technical)	50
Quality of program/graduates	42
Prior success recruiting at college	41
Proximity of college to major locations	39
Number of graduates	12
Success of past graduates hired	4
Quality of laboratories/research facilities	4
Number of minorities/women available	3
Student interest in firm	2

An attempt was made to determine the extent to which certain terms of a job offer might be negotiable. Table 17 shows the number of firms considering each term negotiable.

TABLE 17
NEGOTIABLE TERMS OF A JOB OFFER

Term	Frequency
Starting date	88
Response deadline	82
Starting salary	22
Location of employment	8

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate the greatest changes noted in college graduates over the past five years. Table 18 summarizes the results.

TABLE 18
GREATEST CHANGES IN COLLEGE GRADUATES OVER PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
Better prepared/more sophisticated/more mature	31
Greater concern about career/more goal oriented	14
Better prepared for job search	7
More demanding of salary	5
More selective	4
More experienced graduates available	3
Not as willing to take on responsibility	2
Less loyalty to employer	2
Decline in work ethic	2

AUTOMOTIVE, TIRE AND RUBBER, AND MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT

Because of small numbers of firms participating from both the automotive and heavy equipment and the tire and rubber industrial categories, the two were combined for reporting purposes. The number of firms in any size category is small, consequently all firms were collapsed into two size categories--those with 10,000 or fewer employees and those with over 10,000 employees. (See Table 1.)

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE

	SIZE (Number of Employees)		
	Under 10,000	Over 10,000	TOTAL
NUMBER RESPONDING	6	8	14

RESPONSIBILITY FOR AND ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING

All but two firms (one in each size category) reported having a person at the corporate staff level responsible for all college relations and recruiting activities. Titles vary considerably for that person as well as for the individual to whom the coordinator reports. (See Tables 2.a and 2.b.)

TABLE 2.a
TITLE OF PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR COLLEGE RELATIONS RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)		
	Under 10,000	Over 10,000	TOTAL
Coordinator, College Relations	1		1
Director, Placement and College Relations	1	1	2
Manager, Employee Acquisition	1		1
Manager, Recruiting		1	1
Manager, University Relations		1	1
Manager, Corporate Recruiting		2	2
Supervisor, Salaried Employment		1	1
Supervisor, College Recruiting		1	1
Sr. Personnel Representative	1		1
Compensation Analyst/Recruiter	1		1
TOTAL	5	7	12

TABLE 2.b
TITLE OF PERSON TO WHOM CORPORATE COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING COORDINATOR REPORTS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)		
	Under 10,000	Over 10,000	TOTAL
Vice President	1		1
V.P., Human Resources	1		1
Executive Director, Human Resources		1	1
Director, Corporate Staffing		1	1
Director, Employee Relations		1	1
Manager, Personnel	1		1
Manager, Employment	1		1
Manager, Staff Development	1		1
Manager, Management Development		1	1
Manager, Human Resources		1	1
Manager, Manpower Planning and Development		1	1
Manager, Recruiting and Placement		1	1
TOTAL	5	7	12

Respondents were further asked to indicate which of three organizational patterns best described their college relations and recruiting activities: Centralized (all handled at the corporate level); Combination (coordinated at the corporate level but work carried out at operating unit level); or, Decentralized (all handled at operating unit level). Table 2.c shows that among responding firms the combination structure for college relations/recruiting is favored by the larger firms while smaller firms are more likely to have a combination or decentralized organizational structure.

TABLE 2.c
ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING FUNCTION

	SIZE (Number of Employees)		
	Under 10,000	Over 10,000	TOTAL
Centralized	1	1	2
Combination	2	6	8
Decentralized	3	1	4
TOTAL	6	8	14

In terms of staffing for college relations and recruiting, firms were asked to indicate both the number of persons who devote a majority of their time to the function and the number who devote a lesser amount of time (e.g., personnel who conduct campus interviews). Tables 2.d and 2.e show the response and clearly show a direct relationship between firm size and number of personnel involved (both full- and part-time). The majority of part-time personnel utilized are drawn from non-personnel areas.

TABLE 2.d
NUMBER OF PERSONS DEVOTING A MAJORITY OF TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)		
NUMBER	Under 10,000	Over 10,000	TOTAL
0	2		2
1	3	1	4
2	1	2	3
5		1	1
6		2	2
9		1	1
TOTAL	6	7	13

TABLE 2.e
NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL DEVOTING SOME TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)		
NUMBER	Under 10,000	Over 10,000	TOTAL
1	2		2
2	1		1
8		1	1
15	1	1	2
20	1		1
50	1		1
60		1	1
61		1	1
99		1	1
100		1	1
200		1	1
TOTAL	6	7	13

EVALUATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Nine of the 14 participating firms indicated that there were criteria for evaluating the performance of their college relations and recruiting programs. Most firms cited multiple criteria. Most frequently cited criteria were meeting hiring goals (five firms), offer-acceptance ratio (three firms), and quality of hires (two firms). Other criteria mentioned include cost per hire, retention of candidates hired, the time required to fill positions, and sources of candidates hired (off- vs. on-campus).

ACTIVITIES UTILIZED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Seventeen different activities associated with college relations/recruiting were listed on the survey form and respondents were asked to indicate those activities their firm engaged in and those which were considered high priority.

Printed recruiting material is provided by all 14 firms while 13 of the 14 participating firms cited cultivating key faculty/staff contacts, providing speakers to faculty or student organizations, participation in campus career days, and contributions of cash or equipment to selected campuses as activities included in their college relations/recruiting program. In many respects the firms in this industrial grouping are more comprehensive and uniform in their programs than other industrial groupings as 10 of the 17 activities were engaged in by 10 or more of the participating firms. The cultivation of key faculty/staff contacts was regarded as a priority activity by seven of the firms. Table 3 presents complete findings.

TABLE 3
ACTIVITIES NORMALLY USED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)		
ACTIVITY	Under 10,000	Over 10,000	TOTAL
Printed recruiting material	6 (1)	8 (2)	14 (3)
Audio/visual recruiting material	3	4 (1)	7 (1)
Cultivating key faculty/staff contacts	5 (2)	8 (5)	13 (7)
Cultivating key student contacts	3	7 (4)	10 (4)
Providing speakers to faculty or student organizations	5	8 (3)	13 (3)
Scholarships or grants awarded to an academic department or institution to support student aid (based on either academic performance or financial need)	3	7 (3)	10 (3)
Summer hiring of students	3 (1)	7 (2)	10 (3)
Summer hiring of faculty		1 (1)	1 (1)
Participating in campus career days	5 (1)	8 (1)	13 (2)
Hiring students through co-op, intern or other similar programs sponsored by a campus	4 (1)	7 (1)	11 (2)
Conferences or seminars for placement personnel and faculty at your expense	2	3 (1)	5 (1)
Contributions of cash or equipment to selected campuses	5	8 (2)	13 (2)
Sponsorship of student or faculty projects such as research	2	4	6
Hospitality hours for faculty, placement personnel, or students at professional conferences	1	3 (1)	4 (1)
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students while you are on campus	3 (1)	8 (2)	11 (3)
Gifts of advertising material, e.g., pens, lighters, desk accessories, etc.		4 (1)	4 (1)
Advertising through campus newspapers	4	4 (1)	8 (1)

*First number represents frequency of use while number in parentheses represents high priority activity as indicated by respondents.

Another way of determining high priority activities was to ask firms what they considered the single most important thing they could do to assure productive recruiting year in and year out. Seven of the participating firms identified maintaining good contacts and communication with campuses as the most important thing, while three identified professional, personalized treatment of candidates during the second interview as most important.

Employers were asked whether they utilized hiring bonuses or other incentives to recruit new college graduates or whether they utilized agencies or search firms to hire new graduates. Only one firm reported using incentives and then only with master's degree candidates with prior experience or PhDs. Similarly, only one firm reported using agencies or search firms for new graduates and only as needed for engineering graduates and MBAs.

Three firms reported they used a consulting firm to review their college relations and recruiting program or to train staff. On the other hand, eight firms reported that they had their own training program for personnel who would be engaged in campus interviewing. (See Table 4.)

TABLE 4
FORMAL INTERVIEWER TRAINING PROGRAMS*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)		
PROGRAM	Under 10,000	Over 10,000	TOTAL
YES	3	5	8
NO	3	2	5
TOTAL	6	7	13

*Training programs range from four to 100 hours and average 25.7 hours in length.

COST PER NEW GRADUATE HIRED

Only five firms reported the average cost per new graduate hired (out-of-pocket expense excluding salaries of staff). Most either did not have the data available or had computed cost on some other basis. Average costs reported ranged from $400 to $8,000 and the median was $3,000.

FREQUENCY OF HIRING QUOTA REVIEWS

All firms reported periodic review of hiring quotas with annual review conducted by the largest number of firms (seven). Four firms reported reviewing on a monthly basis, two semi-annually, and one quarterly.

Several items relating to change in the college relations/recruiting function over time were included in the survey. Tables 5 through 8 report the findings.

TABLE 5
GREATEST CHANGES NOTED OVER PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
Increased competition for technical graduates	4
Recruiting has become more professional	2
Escalation of starting salaries	2
Advent of pre-charging third party recruiters	1
Shortages of technical graduates	1
Increase in specialized recruiting	1
Pre-screening of candidates	1
AA/EEO regulations	1
Privacy laws	1
Shift from aggressive recruiting to image maintenance	1
Changes in supply and demand	1
More dual career couples	1
Decline in number of positions available	1
Students better prepared for job search	1

TABLE 6
GREATEST CHANGES TO BE MADE OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
Shortage of engineering and other technical graduates	3
Utilization of more associate degrees and BS in technology graduates due to shortage of engineers	1
Increased competition for technical graduates	1
More co-op programs	1
Decline in on-campus recruiting and more use of technology, computers and A/V systems	1
More time and effort required to recruit fewer graduates	1
More corporate support to colleges for faculty development and equipment	1
Expansion in number of colleges recruited	1
Recruiting will become more specialized	1
Employers will have to pay more attention to non-job factors to compete for technical graduates	1
More emphasis on early faculty and student contacts	1
Less emphasis on recruiting business and computer science graduates and more attention to liberal arts graduates	1
Recruiting will have to become more cost-effective	1
Dealing with declining enrollments	1

TABLE 7
GREATEST PROBLEM (OTHER THAN ECONOMY) FACING EMPLOYERS OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Problem	Frequency
Shortage of technical graduates	5
Competition for technical graduates	2
Escalating salaries/salary compression	2
Cost-effectiveness	1
Improving productivity	1
Third party recruiting	1
Shortage of technical faculty	1
Quality of technical graduates	1
Maintaining supply/demand balance	1
Finding best match of person and job	1

TABLE 8
HAS YOUR ORGANIZATION HAD TO MAKE ANY DRASTIC CHANGES DUE TO THE CONDITION OF THE JOB MARKET OR DUE TO CHANGES IN RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATES?

Response*	Frequency
YES	7
NO	7

*Changes Made	Frequency
Escalate salaries	2
Stop recruiting	2
Shift to regional colleges due to cost of relocation of hires	1
Less reliance on campus recruiting	1
Greater selectivity	1

VOLUME OF RECRUITING ACTIVITY REPORTED

Table 9 reports the number of recent college graduates hired from all sources (campus and non-campus) during the 1981-82 recruiting year.

TABLE 9
RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATE HIRES DURING 1981-82 RECRUITING YEAR

	SIZE (Number of Employees)	
	Under 10,000	Over 10,000
RANGE	0-30	35-570
AVERAGE	12	226

Firms were additionally asked to indicate the percent of hires from both campus and non-campus sources. Responses were not consistently reported and no meaningful summary could be made.

Tables 10 through 15 report campus recruiting activity (number of campuses visited, number of campus interviews conducted, number of candidates invited for second interviews, acceptances of invitation for second interview, employment offers, and acceptances).

TABLE 10
NUMBER OF CAMPUSES VISITED FOR RECRUITING PURPOSES

	SIZE (Number of Employees)	
	Under 10,000	Over 10,000
CAMPUSES VISITED	3-25	32-85
AVERAGE	15	56

TABLE 11
NUMBER OF CANDIDATES INTERVIEWED DURING RECRUITING VISITS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)	
	Under 10,000	Over 10,000
INTERVIEWS	80-350	352-2,600
AVERAGE	216	1,448

TABLE 12
CANDIDATES INVITED FOR SECOND INTERVIEWS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)	
	Under 10,000	Over 10,000
INVITATIONS	9-80	120-850
AVERAGE	36	408

TABLE 13
CANDIDATES ACCEPTING INVITATION FOR SECOND INTERVIEW

	SIZE (Number of Employees)	
	Under 10,000	Over 10,000
ACCEPTANCES	9-75	120-680
AVERAGE	33	347

TABLE 14
OFFERS OF EMPLOYMENT

	SIZE (Number of Employees)	
	Under 10,000	Over 10,000
OFFERS	0-60	49-334
AVERAGE	22	163

TABLE 15
HIRES RESULTING FROM CAMPUS RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)	
	Under 10,000	Over 10,000
HIRES	0-30	35-173
AVERAGE	12	80

These tables provide average figures which represent the experience of 14 automotive, tire and rubber, and mechanical equipment firms. The effects of the economy were clearly felt in this industrial category as seven firms reported a decrease in the number of new graduates hired in 1981-82 compared with 1980-81 (-10 to -100 percent; mean decline -37 percent). Only one firm reported an increase. When firms were asked to compare 1981-82 hiring with the average of the previous five years, nearly identical results were found. Also, nine of the firms reported that they recruited at fewer colleges in 1981-82 than the average number of colleges recruited during the previous five years. Only two firms reported recruiting at more colleges.

When asked to indicate the factors considered in determining whether a particular campus was included in campus recruiting, employers responded with a variety of factors. Table 16 presents the results.

TABLE 16
FACTORS DETERMINING WHETHER A PARTICULAR CAMPUS IS INCLUDED IN RECRUITING

Factor	Frequency
Past success recruiting at college	8
College offers majors sought	8
Quality of program/graduates	7
Proximity of college to major operations	6
Number of graduates	3
Relationship with college/staff	3
Number of women/minority graduates	1

An attempt was also made to determine the extent to which certain terms of a job offer might be negotiable. Clearly, the starting date of employment and the deadline for response to the job offer are considered almost universally negotiable (14 and 13 firms respectively) among participants. (See Table 17.)

TABLE 17
NEGOTIABLE TERMS OF A JOB OFFER

Term	Frequency
Starting date	14
Deadline for response to offer	13
Starting salary	3
Location of employment	1

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate the greatest changes noted in college graduates over the past five years. Table 18 summarizes the responses.

TABLE 18
GREATEST CHANGES IN COLLEGE GRADUATES

Change	Frequency
More career-oriented	2
Better communication/interviewing skills	2
More practical/directed	1
More realistic about market	1
More grade conscious	1
More concern with non-job factors	1
More mature	1
More aware of economic realities	1
More conservative/conformist	1
Better informed	1
More sophisticated about manipulating the recruiting process	1
More selection of academic major based on prospects for employment	1

BUILDING MATERIALS MANUFACTURERS AND CONSTRUCTION

Twenty-five building material manufacturers and construction firms participated in the study by completing and returning survey forms. All size categories are represented. (See Table 1.)

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
NUMBER RESPONDING	3	4	2	6	2	8	25

RESPONSIBILITY FOR AND ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING

Twenty-one firms reported that there was a person at the corporate level who was responsible for all college relations/recruiting activities. (See Table 2.a.) Table 2.b presents the titles of corporate level staff responsible for college relations/recruiting. The years of tenure in the position for these individuals ranged from six months to 20 years with the average being 4.5 years.

TABLE 2.a
IS THERE A PERSON AT THE CORPORATE LEVEL RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL COLLEGE RELATIONS/ RECRUITING ACTIVITIES OF YOUR ORGANIZATION?

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
RESPONSE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	3	3	1	5	1	8	21
NO	0	1	1	1	1	0	4
TOTAL	3	4	2	6	2	8	25

TABLE 2.b
TITLE OF PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Manager, College Relations					1	3	4
Director, Personnel	1			2			3
Chairman of the Board	1						1
Vice President	1						1
Manager, Human Resources				1			1
Manager, Industrial Relations		1					1
Manager, Salaried Personnel						1	1
Manager, Corporate Personnel						1	1
Supervisor, Employment		1		1			2
Supervisor, Professional Recruiting						1	1
Coordinator, College Relations				1			1
Senior Recruiter		1					1
College Relations Representative						1	1
Corporate Recruiting Representative						1	1
Recruiting Administrator			1				1
TOTAL	3	3	1	5	1	8	21

Table 2.c shows the titles of the person to whom the corporate college relations/recruiting coordinator reports.

TABLE 2.c
TITLE OF PERSON TO WHOM CORPORATE COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING COORDINATOR REPORTS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Manager, Corporate Employment		1		2		4	7
V.P., Employee Relations				1		1	2
President	2						2
Director, Personnel				2			2
Director, Human Resources					1		1
Executive V.P.	1						1
V.P., Industrial Relations		1					1
V.P., Personnel		1					1
V.P., Human Resources						1	1
Manager, Placement						1	1
Manager, Staffing and Operations						1	1
Asst. Director, Personnel			1				1
TOTAL	3	3	1	5	1	8	21

Respondents were further asked to indicate which of three organizational patterns best described their college relations and recruiting activities: Centralized (all handled at the corporate level); Combination (coordinated at the corporate level but work carried out at operating unit level); or, Decentralized (all handled at operating unit level). Table 2.d shows that the majority of firms responding follow the combination pattern of organization (13) with the centralized pattern being next most common (8). The larger and presumably more geographically dispersed firms are much more likely to follow the combination pattern.

TABLE 2.d
ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING FUNCTION

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
ORGANIZATION	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Centralized	1	2	0	2	1	2	8
Combination	1	1	1	4	1	5	13
Decentralized	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
TOTAL	2	3	2	6	2	8	23

In terms of staffing for college relations and recruiting, firms were asked to indicate both the number of persons who devote a majority of their time to the function and the number who devote a lesser amount of time (e.g., personnel who conduct campus interviews). Tables 2.e and 2.f show the responses. The majority of part-time staff are drawn from operating areas other than personnel except for the smaller firms (under 2,500 employees) and the largest firms (over 20,000 employees) where about one-half of the responding firms reported that all part-time support staff come from personnel.

TABLE 2.e
NUMBER OF PERSONS DEVOTING A MAJORITY OF TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	3	3		1	1		8
1		1	1	2		3	7
2			1	1		1	3
3				2		2	4
4						1	1
9					1		1
16						1	1
TOTAL	3	4	2	6	2	8	25

TABLE 2.f
NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL DEVOTING SOME
TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	1	2	1	1			5
1	1	1					2
3		1					1
4						2	2
8	1						1
10					1	1	2
12				1			1
13				1			1
15				3		1	4
20					1		1
80			1				1
100						2	2
TOTAL	3	4	2	6	2	6	23

EVALUATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

All but three firms responded to the question "Are there criteria by which the performance of your college relations/recruiting program is evaluated?" Sixteen firms responded affirmatively and six reported that there were no performance criteria. Several firms cited multiple criteria. Most frequently mentioned criteria were meeting hiring goals (seven) or maintaining strong offer to acceptance ratios (six), cost per hire (four), performance of recent hires (two) and meeting AA/EEO targets.

ACTIVITIES UTILIZED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Seventeen different activities associated with college relations/recruiting were listed on the survey form and respondents were asked to indicate those activities their firm engaged in and those which were considered high priority. Table 3 reports the findings. Providing printed recruiting material (22 firms), cultivating key faculty/staff contacts (17 firms), participating in campus career days and providing speakers to faculty or student organizations (16 firms each), and the summer hiring of students (14 firms) were the most popular activities with each engaged in by a majority of the responding firms. No single activity stood out as a high priority in college relations/recruiting in the building materials manufacturers and construction industries.

TABLE 3
ACTIVITIES NORMALLY USED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Printed recruit-material	3 (1)	2 (1)	2 (1)	6 (1)	2 (1)	7 (1)	22 (6)
Audio/visual recruiting material	1	1		2	1	3	8
Cultivating key faculty/staff contacts	3 (1)	2 (1)	2 (1)	4	1	5 (3)	17 (6)
Cultivating key student contacts	1	2	1	2	1	5 (2)	12 (2)
Providing speakers to faculty or student organizations	2	1	2 (1)	4 (1)	1	6 (2)	16 (4)
Scholarships or grants awarded to an academic department or institution to support student aid (based on either academic performance or financial need)	1		1	1	2	4 (1)	9 (1)
Summer hiring of students	1	2 (1)	1 (1)	3 (1)	2	5 (1)	14 (4)
Summer hiring of faculty	1			1		2	4
Participating in campus career days	1	2 (1)	2 (1)	4 (1)	1	6 (1)	16 (4)
Hiring students through co-op, intern or other similar programs sponsored by a campus	1	2 (1)	2	4	2	2 (1)	13 (2)

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Conferences or seminars for placement personnel and faculty at your expense				1		4	5
Contributions of cash or equipment to selected campuses	2		1	3	1	3 (1)	10 (1)
Sponsorship of student or faculty projects, such as research				1		2	3
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students at professional conferences	1			2		1	4
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students while you are on campus		1	1	1		3 (1)	6 (1)
Gifts of advertising materials, e.g., pens, lighters, desk accessories, etc.			1			1	2
Advertising through campus newspapers		1	2	2	1	4	10

*First number represents frequency of use while number in parentheses represents high priority activity as indicated by respondents.

Another way of getting at high priority activities was to ask firms what they considered the single most important thing they could do to assure productive recruiting year in and year out. Twelve of the 23 firms responding to this item indicated that maintaining good communication and relationships with colleges was most important. Maintaining support from management (four firms) and maintaining quality professional staff in college relations and recruiting (three firms) were the only other items mentioned by more than one firm.

Firms were asked whether they ever offered hiring bonuses or other incentives to recent college graduates or whether they utilized agencies or search firms to hire recent college graduates. All participating firms responded in the negative to both items.

Similarly, firms were asked whether they had a formal program to train personnel who would be engaged in campus recruiting. Only eight firms indicated that they had such a training program while 17 did not. (See Table 4.) When asked whether they had ever utilized external consultants to train staff or to review their college relations/recruiting program, two firms responded with a yes.

TABLE 4
FORMAL INTERVIEWER TRAINING PROGRAMS*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
PROGRAM	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	0	0	1	2	1	4	8
NO	3	4	1	4	1	4	17
TOTAL	3	4	2	6	2	8	25

*Of those having a formal training program, the length varied from five to 80 hours with the average at 23 hours.

COST PER NEW GRADUATE HIRED

The average cost (out-of-pocket expense excluding salaries of staff) per new graduate hired ranged from $250 to $3,550. The median cost was $800 per hire.

FREQUENCY OF HIRING QUOTA REVIEW

Most firms (22 of 25) reported periodic review of their hiring quotas. Most common was an annual review (12 firms) followed by semi-annual review (five firms).

Several items relating to change in the college relations and recruiting function over time were included in the survey. Tables 5 through 8 report the results.

TABLE 5
GREATEST CHANGES NOTED OVER PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
Increased demand/competition for top technical grads	7
Escalation in starting salaries	4
Students better prepared for job search	4
Increased use of ongoing college relations programs	3
More professionalism in placement personnel	2
More pre-screening	1
Students more realistic	1
Reduced need for college graduates	1
Students better prepared academically	1
Students have better attitude toward business	1
More professionalism in college relations/ recruiting personnel	1

TABLE 6
GREATEST CHANGES TO BE MADE OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
Need to accommodate dual career couples	3
Dealing with increased competition for top graduates	3
Finding enough technical graduates	3
More pre-screening must come	3
Staying flexible with a changing economy	2
Emphasizing importance of job rather than salary	1
Industry must provide more support to colleges	1
Dealing with decline in needs	1
Industry must stay close to colleges and students	1
Industry needs input into the curriculum	1

TABLE 7
GREATEST PROBLEM (OTHER THAN ECONOMY) FACING EMPLOYERS OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
Decline in number of high tech grads	3
Decline in enrollments generally	2
Curtailment of recruiting activity	2
Dealing with dual career couples	2
Decline in quality of college education	1
Dealing with oversupply of certain majors	1
Loss of faculty to industry	1
Maintaining visibility on campuses	1
Keeping emphasis on job rather than salary	1
Becoming more cost-effective	1
Getting campuses to allow pre-screening	1
Maintaining support of top management	1
Unwillingness of graduates to relocate	1

TABLE 8
HAS YOUR ORGANIZATION HAD TO MAKE ANY DRASTIC CHANGES DUE TO THE CONDITIONS OF THE JOB MARKET OR DUE TO CHANGES IN RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATES?

Response*	Frequency
YES	4
NO	19

*Changes made	Frequency
Escalate starting salaries	2
More thorough screening	1
Assist with relocation expenses	1

Because of the diversity of responses, it is difficult to identify specific trends. However, the responses of those participating do represent the thinking of a number of experienced personnel and may be helpful to others within the same industries.

VOLUME OF RECRUITING ACTIVITY REPORTED

Table 9 presents the number of recent college graduates hired by participating firms from all sources (campus and non-campus) during the 1981-82 recruiting year.

TABLE 9
RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATE HIRES DURING 1981-82 RECRUITING YEAR

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
RANGE	3-10	0-18	0-125	1-35	13	3-715
AVERAGE	5	4	63	15	13	150

Firms were additionally asked to indicate the percent of hires from both campus and non-campus sources. Results were not consistently reported and no comparisons could be made. By comparing Tables 9 and 15 (total new graduate hires and total hires from campus recruiting, respectively), however, it is evident that most hires result from campus recruiting.

Tables 10 through 15 report campus recruiting activity (number of campus interviews conducted, number of candidates invited for second interviews, acceptance of invitation for second interview, employment offers made, and acceptances).

TABLE 10
NUMBER OF CAMPUSES VISITED FOR RECRUITING PURPOSES

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
CAMPUSES VISITED	4-6	8-11	3-73	15-70	24	8-284
AVERAGE	5	10	38	33	24	65

TABLE 11
NUMBER OF CANDIDATES INTERVIEWED DURING RECRUITING VISITS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INTERVIEWS	83-120	104-120	74-1,175	306-1,048	790	150-10,057
AVERAGE	87	112	625	869	790	2,596

TABLE 12
CANDIDATES INVITED FOR SECOND INTERVIEWS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INVITATIONS	5-10	20	446	10-120	156	6-1,200
AVERAGE	7	20	446	71	156	326

TABLE 13
CANDIDATES ACCEPTING INVITATION FOR SECOND INTERVIEW

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
ACCEPTANCES	4-6	20	440	10-120	119	6-1,170
AVERAGE	5	20	440	61	119	310

TABLE 14
OFFERS OF EMPLOYMENT

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
OFFERS	4-6	3	237	1-70	39	4-1,138
AVERAGE	5	3	237	26	39	221

TABLE 15
HIRES RESULTING FROM CAMPUS RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
HIRES	3	2	125	1-40	13	3-715
AVERAGE	3	2	125	16	13	139

These tables represent the combined experience of firms in the building materials manufacturers and construction industries during the 1981-82 recruiting year. Seven of these firms reported an increase in hiring over 1980-81 (five to 300 percent; median increase 30 percent); three reported no change, and 11 reported a decrease (-25 to -99 percent;

median decline -50 percent). Similarly, firms reported how the number of campuses visited in 1981-82 compared with the number visited in 1980-81. Six reported an increase, eight no change, and nine reported a decrease.

Firms were next asked to indicate those factors which determined whether a particular campus was included in campus recruiting. Table 16 presents the findings. While most firms listed multiple factors, the quality of the academic program/graduates (16 firms), prior success recruiting at the school (13 firms), and proximity to major locations and offering appropriate majors--usually technical (10 firms each) stand out.

TABLE 16
FACTORS DETERMINING WHETHER A PARTICULAR CAMPUS IS INCLUDED IN RECRUITING

Factor	Frequency
Quality of academic program/graduates	16
Prior success recruiting at college	13
Offers appropriate majors	10
Proximity to major locations	10
Relationships with faculty/staff	4
Success of prior graduates in firm	2
Number of graduates	1
Enrollment of women and minorities	1

An attempt was made to determine whether terms of a job offer were negotiable. Table 17 shows the number of firms considering each term negotiable. It would appear that the starting date of employment and the deadline for response to an offer of employment are generally accepted as negotiable while starting salary and location of employment are considered firm by the vast majority of firms participating.

TABLE 17
NEGOTIABLE TERMS OF A JOB OFFER

Term	Frequency
Starting date	22
Deadline for response to offer	20
Location of employment	7
Starting salary	6

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate the greatest changes noted in college graduates over the past five years. Table 18 summarizes the results.

TABLE 18
GREATEST CHANGES IN COLLEGE GRADUATES OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
Much more selective	4
Better prepared for the job search	3
Salary demands have become greater	2
Greater reluctance to relocate	2
Better prepared academically	2
More career-oriented	2
Better understanding of business	2
Lack communication skills	1
Less sure of vocational goals	1
Poorer prepared academically	1
More women and minorities available	1
More older graduates available	1

CHEMICALS, DRUGS, AND ALLIED PRODUCTS

Forty-five firms in the chemicals, drugs, and allied products industries participated in the study by returning completed forms. Firms of all sizes are represented, however, larger firms responded at a higher rate. Table 1 shows the participation of firms by size.

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE

SIZE (Number of Employees)

	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
NUMBER RESPONDING	5	3	4	6	8	19	45

RESPONSIBILITY FOR AND ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING

Thirty-eight of the participating firms indicated that there was a person at the corporate level responsible for all college relations/recruiting activities. (See Table 2.a.) The title Manager of College Relations was most popular as 18 firms report its use for the person responsible for college relations/recruiting activities. (See Table 2.b.) Years of tenure for incumbents in the position ranged from one to 30 with the average being 4.8 years.

TABLE 2.a
IS THERE A PERSON AT THE CORPORATE LEVEL
RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL COLLEGE RELATIONS/
RECRUITING ACTIVITIES OF YOUR ORGANIZATION?

SIZE (Number of Employees)

RESPONSE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	4	1	4	6	6	17	38
NO	1	1	0	0	2	2	6
TOTAL	5	2	4	6	8	19	44

TABLE 2.b
TITLE OF PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Manager, College Relations		1	1	2	3	12	19
Manager, Personnel	1				2		3
Manager, Professional Employment			1				1
Manager, Recruiting			1	1			2
Manager, Employment				1	1		2
Manager, Employee Staffing				1			1
Manager, Corporate Staffing						2	2
Director, Professional Employment						2	2
Director, Personnel Resources						1	1
Director, College Relations	1						1
Director, Corporate Staffing				1			1
Supervisor, Corporate Employment						1	1
Corporate Recruiter	1						1
TOTAL	3	1	3	6	6	18	37

Table 2.c lists the titles of the person to whom the corporate college relations/recruiting officer reports.

TABLE 2.c
TITLE OF PERSON TO WHOM CORPORATE COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING COORDINATOR REPORTS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Director, Human Resources				1	1	2	4
Director, Personnel					1	1	2
Manager, Human Resources	1						1
Manager, Personnel				2	1		3
Manager Employee Relations		1				1	2
Manager, Corporate Employment				1			1
V.P., Employee Relations				1		1	2
Manager, Corporate Staffing						2	2
Director, Personnel Planning					1	1	2
President	1						1
V.P., Administration	1						1
V.P., Personnel			1				1
Manager, Recruiting				1			1
Manager, Manpower Planning and Development			1			1	2
Director, Manpower Planning					1		1
Director, Corporate Staffing					1		1
Director, Exec. Staffing						1	1

(Continued)

Table 2.c (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Vice President						1	1
Asst. Director, Executive and Professional Staffing						1	1
V.P., Human Resources			2			2	4
Director, Personnel Relations						2	2
V.P., Organizational Development						1	1
Manager, Employment						2	2
TOTAL	3	1	4	6	6	19	39

Respondents were further asked to indicate which of three organizational patterns best characterized their college relations and recruiting activities: Centralized (all handled at the corporate level); Combination (coordinated at corporate level but work carried out at operating unit level); or, Decentralized (all handled at operating unit level). Table 2.d shows that for a majority of participating firms (23) the combination pattern is most frequently followed, especially among the largest firms where 15 of 19 firms follow this pattern.

TABLE 2.d
ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING FUNCTION

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
ORGANIZATION	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Centralized	2	1	2	3	3	4	15
Combination	1	0	2	3	2	15	23
Decentralized	1	1	0	0	1	0	3
TOTAL	4	2	4	6	6	19	41

In terms of staffing for college relations and recruiting, firms were asked to indicate both the number of persons who devote a majority of their time to the function and the number who devote a lesser amount of time (e.g., personnel who conduct campus interviews). Tables 2.e and 2.f show the responses and point out a direct relationship between number of personnel involved (both full- and part-time) and size of firm. Most part-time staff are drawn from operating units other than personnel.

TABLE 2.e
NUMBER OF PERSONS DEVOTING A MAJORITY OF TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	2	2	2		2	1	9
1	2		1	3	2	3	11
2		1		1	2	3	7
3				1		3	4
4						2	2
5				1	1	1	3
10						1	1
12						1	1
21						1	1
27						1	1
30						1	1
37						1	1
TOTAL	4	3	3	6	7	19	42

TABLE 2.f
NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL DEVOTING SOME TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	1						1
1	1						1
2	2	1					3
3			1				1
8				1			1
10					2		2
12				1			1
14		1					1
15						1	1
16					1		1
17						1	1
18			1				1
20						1	1
25				1			1
28						1	1
30		1	1	1			3
35						2	2
40					1	1	2
45					1		1
50				1		2	3
60				1			1
71						1	1
75					1		1
85						1	1
100					1	1	2
150						2	2
200						3	3
900						1	1
TOTAL	4	3	3	6	7	18	41

EVALUATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

All but one firm responded to the question "Are there criteria by which the performance of your college relations/recruiting program is evaluated?" Thirty-five firms responded affirmatively while only eight indicated that there were no performance criteria. Several firms listed multiple criteria. The most frequently cited were: the number of hires/meeting hiring goals/maintaining a strong offer to hire ratio (31 firms); cost per hire (10 firms); and, quality of graduates hired (eight firms).

ACTIVITIES UTILIZED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Seventeen different activities associated with college relations/recruiting were listed on the survey form and respondents were asked to indicate the activities their firm engaged in and those which were considered high priority. Table 3 reports the findings.

Over one-half of the participating firms engaged in nine of the listed activities. Most popular were providing printed recruiting material (40 firms), cultivating key faculty/staff contacts (38 firms), summer hiring of students (37 firms), providing speakers to faculty or student organizations (36 firms), participating in campus career days (34 firms), and hiring students through co-op or intern programs (33 firms). Twenty-eight firms indicated they provided contributions of cash or equipment to selected campuses as part of their college relations/recruiting program. No activity was reported as a high priority by a majority of firms, however, providing printed recruiting material (13), hiring students through co-op or intern programs (10), and cultivating key faculty/staff contacts (10) were most frequently cited.

TABLE 3
ACTIVITIES NORMALLY USED IN
COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Printed recruiting material	3 (1)	3 (1)	3 (2)	6 (3)	6 (1)	19 (5)	40 (13)
AV recruiting material				2	1	12	15
Cultivating key faculty/staff contacts	3	3 (1)	3	5 (2)	5 (1)	19 (6)	38 (10)
Cultivating key student contacts	1	1 (1)	2	4 (1)	4 (1)	18 (1)	30 (4)
Providing speakers to faculty or student organizations	2	3 (1)	2	5 (2)	5	19 (2)	36 (5)

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,00	TOTAL
Scholarships or grants awarded to an academic department or institution to support student aid (based on either academic performance or financial need)	1	1	2 (1)	3	2	15 (2)	24 (3)
Summer hiring of students	3 (1)	1	2 (1)	6 (1)	6 (1)	19 (4)	37 (8)
Summer hiring of faculty	1			1		6	8
Participating in campus career days	2	2	1	5 (1)	5	19 (4)	34 (5)
Hiring students through co-op, intern or other similar programs sponsored by a campus	2		3 (1)	6 (2)	6 (2)	16 (5)	33(10)
Conferences or seminars for placement personnel and faculty at your expense				1	2	8	11
Contributions of cash or equipment to selected campuses		1	2	4	4 (2)	17 (1)	28 (3)
Sponsorship of student or faculty projects, such as research	1		2	2	3	16	24

(Continued)

Table 3 (continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students at professional conferences			2	1	1	8	12
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students while you are on campus		1	2	3	4	10	20
Gifts of advertising materials, e.g., pens, lighters, desk accessories, etc.		1	2	1	1	8	13
Advertising through campus newspapers		1	2 (1)	4	3	8	18 (1)

*First number represents frequency of use while number in parentheses represents high priority activity as indicated by respondents.

Another way of assessing high priority activities was to ask firms what they considered the single most important thing they could do to assure productive recruiting year in and year out. Here the most frequent responses were to maintain strong contacts and communication with colleges (22 firms) and to maintain consistency in both recruiting practices and recruiting staff (7 firms).

The firms were asked whether they ever offered hiring bonuses or other incentives to new college graduate hires or whether they utilized agencies or search firms to hire new graduates. Only one firm indicated it offered hiring bonuses (for top MBAs only) and four said that they utilized agencies or search firms. None of the latter firms indicated they would pay fees to agencies or search firms.

Employers were also asked whether they ever utilized external consultants to review their college relations/recruiting operations, or to train staff. Five firms reported use of such consultants. Most firms (27) indicated that they had developed their own program to train staff who would be engaged in campus recruiting. (See Table 4.)

TABLE 4
FORMAL INTERVIEWER TRAINING PROGRAMS*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
PROGRAM	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	1	2	1	5	2	16	27
NO	3	1	2	1	5	3	15
TOTAL	4	3	3	6	7	19	42

*Of those firms having a formal training program, the programs last from two to 40 hours and average 11.6 hours in length.

COST PER NEW GRADUATE HIRED

The average out-of-pocket expense (excluding salaries of staff) per new graduate hired was reported by 18 firms and ranged from $200 to $6,500 with the median cost at $2,000. Most firms did not have average cost data to report.

FREQUENCY OF HIRING QUOTA REVIEW

When asked to indicate the frequency with which they reviewed their hiring quota, the largest number of firms (19) reported review on an annual basis while 11 reported quarterly review and seven monthly review. Only two firms reported weekly review and two additional firms reported conducting reviews only as needed.

Several items relating to change in the college relations/recruiting function over time were included in the survey. Tables 5 through 8 report results.

TABLE 5
GREATEST CHANGES NOTED OVER PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
Greater competition for graduates (especially technical)	8
Salary escalation/compression	4
Shortage of technical graduates	3
More pre-screening allowed	2
Placement staffs more professional/helpful	2
Recruiters more professional	2
Earlier recruiting and offer timetable	2
Increase in number of graduates from which to select	2
Increased emphasis on technical degrees	2
Greater use of technical recruiters	1
Graduates more mature	1
Trend toward more business majors obtaining the MBA	1
Graduates more selective	1
Closer relationship with key schools	1
Decline in recruiting dominance by heavy industrial firms	1
Rising recruiting costs	1
More involvement by placement staff and faculty	1
Fewer firms committed to general management development programs	1

TABLE 6
GREATEST CHANGES TO BE MADE OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
Adjusting to short supply of and greater competition for technical graduates	11
Need to become more cost-effective	6
Need to develop more sophisticated techniques/tracking systems through use of the computer	2
Need to develop better screening methods	2
Colleges must allow more pre-screening	2
Colleges and employers must cooperate more	2
Companies need to provide more financial and technical support to colleges	2
More graduates will be available than jobs	2
Need to develop programs for dual career couples	1
Need better models for manpower forecasting	1
Increases in minority technical graduates	1
Starting salaries must be kept in line	1
Shifting of much recruiting off the campus	1
More emphasis on environmental and social issues will shift focus of recruiting	1

TABLE 7
GREATEST PROBLEM (OTHER THAN ECONOMY) FACING EMPLOYERS OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Problem	Frequency
Shortage of technical graduates	12
Escalation in starting salaries/salary compression	6
Developing better screening mechanisms to select best candidates from the many available	3
Maintaining support from top management	2
Cost-effectiveness	2
General shortage of graduates	2
Fewer jobs available	2
Shortages of minorities in technical fields	1
Keeping graduates using placement services	1
Quality of candidates declining	1
Identifying non-technical majors who can fill in to meet technical needs	1
Maintaining company control in employee selection	1

TABLE 8
HAS YOUR ORGANIZATION HAD TO MAKE ANY DRASTIC CHANGES DUE TO THE CONDITIONS OF THE JOB MARKET OR DUE TO CHANGES IN RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATES?

Response*	Frequency
YES	14
NO	28

*Changes made	Frequency
Escalate salaries	6
Reduce hiring	4
Reduce recruiting activities	3
More thorough screening	1

Because of the lack of consensus on many items noted, it is difficult to identify trends. There is concern, however, on the part of a number of firms that the supply of technical graduates will not be able to keep up with demand in the near future.

VOLUME OF RECRUITING ACTIVITY REPORTED

Table 9 reports the number of recent college graduates hired by participating firms from all sources (campus and non-campus) during the 1981-82 recruiting year.

TABLE 9
RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATE HIRES DURING 1981-82 RECRUITING YEAR

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
RANGE	0-19	0-6	5-18	8-60	7-67	0-1,100
AVERAGE	6	3	13	38	21	293

Firms were additionally asked to indicate the percent of hires from campus and non-campus sources. Due to inconsistency in reporting, results cannot be reported. A comparison of Tables 9 and 15 (total college graduate hires and hires resulting from campus recruiting respectively) suggests that the vast majority of new graduates were hired through campus recruiting efforts.

Tables 10 through 15 report campus recruiting activity (number of campuses visited, number of campus interviews conducted, number of candidates invited for second interviews, acceptance of invitation for second interviews, employment offers, and acceptances).

TABLE 10
NUMBER OF CAMPUSES VISITED FOR RECRUITING PURPOSES

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
CAMPUSES VISITED	3-6	3-16	7-38	10-55	0-70	16-287
AVERAGE	4	10	10	29	28	109

TABLE 11
NUMBER OF CANDIDATES INTERVIEWED DURING RECRUITING VISITS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INTERVIEWS	30-135	25-137	84-642	163-1,500	91-2,300	423-25,000
AVERAGE	80	81	424	640	947	5,547

TABLE 12
CANDIDATES INVITED FOR SECOND INTERVIEWS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INVITATIONS	10-25	8-43	8-94	48-300	8-534	25-3,600
AVERAGE	19	22	47	153	188	1,075

TABLE 13
CANDIDATES ACCEPTING INVITATION FOR SECOND INTERVIEW

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
ACCEPTANCES	10-23	6-35	8-86	41-270	8-470	22-2,400
AVERAGE	18	21	44	133	155	790

TABLE 14
OFFERS OF EMPLOYMENT

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
OFFERS	2-19	2-18	6-40	0-120	3-130	9-1,717
AVERAGE	8	10	23	59	47	532

TABLE 15
HIRES RESULTING FROM CAMPUS RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
HIRES	2-19	0-5	5-18	0-60	3-67	6-846
AVERAGE	6	3	13	37	21	266

These tables provide average figures for firms of varying size which represent their experience in college recruiting during the 1981-82 recruiting year. When asked how the number of new recruits in 1981-82 compared with the previous year, 15 firms reported an increase (4 to 175 percent; median increase 20 percent), six reported no change, and 17 reported a decline (-4 to -90 percent; median decline -25 percent). When compared with the average number of hires over the previous five years, only 12 firms reported an increase, seven no change or did not know, and 13 reported a decline. Similarly, only nine firms reported recruiting at more schools in 1981-82 than in previous years, 13 reported no change, and 21 reported a decline.

When asked to indicate the factors considered in determining whether a particular campus was included in campus recruiting, a variety of responses was given, however, there was considerable agreement on four of the factors: proximity of college to major operations (25 firms); prior success recruiting at college (24 firms); quality of the program/graduates (22 firms); and appropriateness of majors offered (21 firms). Table 16 presents the full results.

TABLE 16
FACTORS DETERMINING WHETHER A PARTICULAR CAMPUS IS INCLUDED IN RECRUITING

Factor	Frequency
Proximity of college to major locations	25
Prior success recruiting at college	24
Quality of program/graduates	22
Appropriateness of majors offered	21
Number of graduates	8
Success of previous graduates in firm	6
Women and minority candidates available	4
Relationships with faculty/staff	3
Does the college offer a co-op program?	1

An attempt was made to determine the extent to which certain terms of a job offer might be negotiable. Table 17 reports the results. Clearly, the starting date and deadline for response to a job offer are considered negotiable by nearly all firms.

TABLE 17
NEGOTIABLE TERMS OF A JOB OFFER

Term	Frequency
Starting date	42
Deadline for response to offer	40
Location of employment	6
Starting salary	6

Finally, participating firms were asked to indicate the greatest changes noted in college graduates over the past five years. Table 18 presents the results.

TABLE 18
GREATEST CHANGES IN COLLEGE GRADUATES OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
More career-oriented	6
More realistic about business world	6
More mature/serious	5
Stronger work ethic	5
Better prepared academically	5
Better prepared for job search	4
Less geographically mobile	3
More concerned with "quality of life" issues than with job	3
Expect more of employers	3
Stronger work experience	2
More women/minorities available in technical fields	2
More conservative	2
Poorer communication skills	2
More "world-wise"	1
Less dedicated	1
Poorer prepared academically	1
Less enthusiasm for work	1
Less research-oriented	1
Have more unrealistic salary expectations	1
Poorer prepared for long-term career progress	1

ELECTRICAL MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT

Sixteen firms in the electrical machinery and equipment industry participated in the study by returning completed forms. All size categories were represented except firms in the 5,001-10,000 employee range. (See Table 1 for distribution by size.)

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE

SIZE (Number of Employees)

	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
NUMBER RESPONDING	3	2	4	0	2	5	16

RESPONSIBILITY FOR AND ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING

Eleven of the 16 firms reported that there was a person responsible for all college relations/recruiting activities. (See Table 2.a.) Titles of the persons responsible for the college relations/recruiting function are reported in Table 2.b. Years of tenure in the position ranged from six months to 10 years with the average being 3.3 years.

TABLE 2.a
IS THERE A PERSON AT THE CORPORATE LEVEL
RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL COLLEGE RELATIONS/
RECRUITING ACTIVITIES OF YOUR ORGANIZATION?

SIZE (Number of Employees)

RESPONSE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	1	1	2	0	2	5	11
NO	2	1	2	0	0	0	5
TOTAL	3	2	4	0	2	5	16

TABLE 2.b
TITLE OF PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

SIZE (Number of Employees)

TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Manager, College Relations					1	1	2
Manager, Employment and College Relations						2	2
Manager, Employment						1	1
Manager, Graduate Employment and Placement			1				1
Coordinator, College Relations					1		1
Director, Management Resources						1	1
Director, Employee Relations			1				1
Director, Industrial Relations	1						1
Director, Personnel		1					1
TOTAL	1	1	2	0	2	5	11

Table 2.c reports the titles of the person to whom the college relations/recruiting coordinator reports.

TABLE 2.c
TITLE OF PERSON TO WHOM CORPORATE COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING COORDINATOR REPORTS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Director, Personnel						1	1
Division President	1						1
V.P., Operations		1					1
V.P., Personnel and Industrial Relations			1				1
V.P., Human Resources			1				1
Director, Staffing					1		1
Manager, Professional and Technical Employment					1		1
V.P., Personnel						1	1
Manager, Staffing						1	1
Director, Education and Training						1	1
Manager, Human Resources						1	1
TOTAL	1	1	2	0	2	5	11

Respondents were further asked to indicate which of three organizational patterns best described their college relations and recruiting activities: Centralized (all handled at the corporate level); Combination (coordinated at the corporate level but work carried out at operating unit level); or, Decentralized (all handled at operating unit level). Table 2.d shows that among electrical machinery and equipment firms the combination approach is favored by the majority of firms (nine).

TABLE 2.d
ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING FUNCTION

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
ORGANIZATION	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Centralized	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Combination	0	0	3	0	2	4	9
Decentralized	3	1	1	0	0	0	5
TOTAL	3	2	4	0	2	5	16

In terms of staffing for college relations and recruiting, firms were asked to indicate both the number of persons who devote a majority of their time to the function and the number who devote a lesser amount of time (e.g., personnel who conduct campus interviews). Tables 2.e and 2.f show the responses and point out the relationship between size of firm and number of personnel involved (both full- and part-time). The majority of part-time staff are drawn from non-personnel units.

TABLE 2.e
NUMBER OF PERSONS DEVOTING A MAJORITY OF TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	3	1	3			1	8
1		1			1		2
2			1				1
8						1	1
9						1	1
10					1	1	2
18						1	1
TOTAL	3	2	4	0	2	5	16

TABLE 2.f
NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL DEVOTING SOME TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	1						1
1	1	1	1				3
2	1	1	1				3
8			1				1
10					1		1
12			1				1
23						1	1
25					1		1
50						1	1
200						1	1
800						2	2
TOTAL	3	2	4	0	2	5	6

EVALUATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Fifteen firms responded to the question "Are there criteria by which the performance of your college relations/recruiting program is evaluated?" Ten reported there were criteria for program evaluation while five reported there were not. Meeting hiring goals was most frequently cited as performance criteria (five firms) while quality of candidates was mentioned by three firms.

ACTIVITIES UTILIZED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Seventeen different activities associated with college relations/recruiting were listed on the survey form and respondents were asked to indicate those activities their firm engaged in and those which were considered high priority. Table 3 reports the findings.

Most popular activities were: providing printed recruiting material (15 firms), summer hiring of students (12 firms), cultivating key faculty/staff contacts and providing speakers for faculty or student organizations (11 firms each), participating in campus career days (ten firms), and contributions of cash or equipment to selected campus (11). No single activity stands out as high priority among firms in the electrical machinery and equipment industry.

TABLE 3
ACTIVITIES NORMALLY USED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Printed Recruiting material	3	1	4 (1)		2	5 (1)	15 (2)
Audio/visual recruiting material						2	2
Cultivating key faculty/staff contacts	1		3 (1)		2	5 (2)	11 (3)
Cultivating key student contacts		1	1		1	4 (1)	7 (1)
Providing speakers to faculty or student organizations	1	1	2		2 (1)	5	11 (1)
Scholarships or grants awarded to an academic department or institution to support student aid (based on either academic performance or financial need)			2 (1)		1	2	5 (1)
Summer hiring of students		1	4 (1)		2	5 (1)	12 (2)
Summer hiring of faculty					1	3	4
Participating in campus career days	1	1	2		2	4	10
Hiring students through co-op, intern or other similar programs sponsored by a campus	1 (1)		1		2 (1)	4	8 (2)

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Conferences or seminars for placement personnel and faculty at your expense						3	3
Contributions of cash or equipment to selected campuses	1	2	3 (1)		2 (1)	3	11 (2)
Sponsorship of student or faculty projects, such as research			2		1	1	4
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students at professional conferences	1				1	2	4
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel or students while you are on campus			1		1	4	6
Gifts of advertising materials, e.g., pens, lighters, desk accessories, etc.			1			2	3
Advertising through campus newspapers	1	1	1		1		4

*First number represents frequency of use while number in parentheses represents high priority activity as indicated by respondents.

In an effort to identify high priority college relations/recruiting activities, survey respondents were asked, "What do you consider the single most important thing your college relations/recruiting program does or should do to assure productive recruiting year in and year out?" Nine firms indicated that maintaining good contacts and communication with colleges was the most important thing they could do.

Firms were next asked whether they ever offered hiring bonuses or other incentives to new college graduates or whether they ever used agencies or search firms in hiring new graduates. No firm reported offering hiring bonuses or other incentives and only one firm reported using agencies or search firms (for engineers only and occasionally was willing to pay fees).

Similarly, employers were asked whether they utilized external consultants to review college relations/recruiting operations or to train staff. No firm reported using consultants. When asked whether they had a formal training program for personnel who are engaged in campus interviewing, five firms responded affirmatively. (See Table 4.) Training lasted from two to 12 hours and averaged six hours.

TABLE 4
FORMAL INTERVIEWER TRAINING PROGRAMS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
PROGRAM	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	0	0	1		1	3	5
NO	3	2	3		1	2	11
TOTAL	3	2	4	0	2	5	16

COST PER NEW GRADUATE HIRED

The average cost (out-of-pocket expense excluding salaries of staff) per new graduate hired ranged from $750 to $2,500. The median cost was $1,000 per hire.

FREQUENCY OF HIRING QUOTA REVIEW

The majority of firms (ten) indicated that they reviewed their hiring quotas annually. Three firms reviewed quarterly, two monthly, and one semi-annually.

Several items relating to change in the college relations/recruiting function over time were included in the survey. Tables 5 through 8 report the results.

TABLE 5
GREATEST CHANGES NOTED OVER PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
Fewer engineering graduates available	3
Fewer opportunities for graduates	2
Escalation of salaries	2
Move to more pre-selection	1
Students are better prepared for job search	1
Increased pressure to hire top 10 percent	1
Decline in demand for business majors	1
Quality of students improved	1
Impact of AA/EEO	1
Graduates more job-security conscious	1
Colleges offering fewer services to graduates	1

TABLE 6
GREATEST CHANGES TO BE MADE OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
Increased competition for technical graduates	3
Need to become more cost-effective	3
Need to bring new graduates up-to-speed	2
faster so they can contribute sooner	2
Better college relations programs needed	1
Keeping recruiters up-to-date with company needs	1

TABLE 7
GREATEST PROBLEM (OTHER THAN ECONOMY) FACING EMPLOYERS OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Problem	Frequency
Providing meaningful assignments for new college graduates	2
Finding time to devote to college relations	2
Maintaining professional, qualified staff	2
Maintaining financial support for college relations/recruiting	1
Keeping up with industry and company changes	1
Improving professional competence of placement personnel	1
Bringing new graduates up-to-speed faster so they can contribute sooner	1
Shortage of technical graduates	1
Decline in number of jobs	1
Deterioration of U.S. colleges and universities	1

TABLE 8
HAS YOUR ORGANIZATION HAD TO MAKE ANY DRASTIC CHANGES DUE TO THE CONDITIONS OF THE JOB MARKET OR DUE TO CHANGES IN RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATES?

Response*	Frequency
YES	7
NO	9

*Changes Made	Frequency
Escalation of salaries	4
Reduce recruiting	1
Relocate to more desirable location	1
More thorough screening	1
Increase relocation allowance	1

VOLUME OF RECRUITING ACTIVITY REPORTED

Table 9 presents the number of recent college graduates hired by participating firms from all sources (campus and non-campus) during the 1981-82 recruiting year.

TABLE 9
RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATE HIRES DURING 1981-82 RECRUITING YEAR

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
RANGE	0	1-15	1-15	0	5-66	25-1,600
AVERAGE	0	8	6	0	36	805

Firms were additionally asked to indicate the percent of hires from both campus and non-campus sources. Results were not consistently reported and no comparisons could be made. By comparing Tables 9 and 15 (total new graduate hires and total hires from campus recruiting, respectively), however, it is evident that most hires result from campus recruiting.

Tables 10 through 15 report campus recruiting activity (number of campuses visited, number of campus interviews conducted, number of candidates invited for second interviews, acceptance of invitation for second interview, employment offers made, and acceptances).

TABLE 10
NUMBER OF CAMPUSES VISITED FOR RECRUITING PURPOSES

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
CAMPUSES VISITED	0-6	2-11	5-14	0	58-102	180-400
AVERAGE	2	7	8	0	80	265

TABLE 11
NUMBER OF CANDIDATES INTERVIEWED DURING RECRUITING VISITS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INTERVIEWS	10-25	30-350	20-210	0	791-1,488	2,025-13,679
AVERAGE	18	190	83	0	1,140	9,234

TABLE 12
CANDIDATES INVITED FOR SECOND INTERVIEWS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INVITATIONS	1-5	0-150	5-25	0	48-303	650-4,000
AVERAGE	3	75	13	0	176	2,702

TABLE 13
CANDIDATES ACCEPTING INVITATION FOR SECOND INTERVIEW

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
ACCEPTANCES	1-3	75	5-25	0	48-303	575-3,200
AVERAGE	2	75	12	0	176	2,125

TABLE 14
OFFERS OF EMPLOYMENT

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
OFFERS	0-1	25	1-19	0	13-158	535-1,975
AVERAGE	.5	25	8	0	86	1,370

TABLE 15
HIRES RESULTING FROM CAMPUS RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
HIRES	0	15	1-13	0	5-66	452-1,200
AVERAGE	0	15	6	0	36	801

These tables provide figures which represent the experience of electrical machinery and equipment firms of various size in college recruiting during 1981-82. Only one firm reported hiring more graduates during 1981-82 than in 1980-81 while three reported hiring the same number and eight reported a decrease (-10 to -96 percent fewer; median decrease is -30 percent). Similarly, only three firms report an increase in hires over the average of the past five years, two report no change and five a decrease. Ten of the firms also reported recruiting at fewer campuses in 1981-82. The impact of the recession appears to have hit this industry particularly hard.

When asked to indicate the factors considered in determining whether a particular campus was included in campus recruiting, a variety of responses were given. (See Table 16.)

TABLE 16
FACTORS DETERMINING WHETHER A PARTICULAR CAMPUS IS INCLUDED IN RECRUITING

Factor	Frequency
Proximity of campus to major locations	9
College offers majors sought	8
Quality of program/graduates	7
Past success recruiting at college	6
Success of previous hires in company	3
Good relationships with college	2
Number of graduates	1
Pre-selection allowed	1

An attempt was made to determine whether terms of a job offer were negotiable. Table 17 shows the number of firms considering each term negotiable. It appears that response deadlines for offers and starting date are open for negotiation with most firms (15 of 16 responding).

TABLE 17
NEGOTIABLE TERMS OF A JOB OFFER

Term	Frequency
Deadline for response to offer	15
Starting date	15
Starting salary	3
Location of employment	2

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate the greatest changes noted in college graduates over the past five years. Table 18 summarizes the results.

TABLE 18
GREATEST CHANGES IN COLLEGE GRADUATES

Change	Frequency
Technical graduates better educated	3
More conservative	3
More demanding of salary and benefits	2
More selective	1
More mature	1
Less mobile	1
More career-minded	1
Too much emphasis placed on career rather than first job	1
Less loyalty to company	1
Poorer communication skills	1
More foreign students in technical fields	1

FOOD AND BEVERAGE PROCESSING

Twenty firms in the food and beverage processing industry participated in the study by returning completed forms. Table 1 presents the number of respondents by size of their organization.

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE

SIZE (Number of Employees)

	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
NUMBER RESPONDING	1	3	1	5	6	4	20

RESPONSIBILITY FOR AND ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING

All but three firms reported having a person responsible for all college relations/recruiting activities. (See Table 2.a.) Titles vary considerably for the person responsible for the activity. (See Table 2.b.) Years of tenure in the position ranged from newly appointed to 10 years with the average being 3.2 years.

TABLE 2.a
IS THERE A PERSON AT THE CORPORATE LEVEL RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL COLLEGE RELATIONS/ RECRUITING ACTIVITIES OF YOUR ORGANIZATION?

SIZE (Number of Employees)

RESPONSE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	0	3	1	4	6	3	17
NO	1	0	0	1	0	1	3
TOTAL	1	3	1	5	6	4	20

TABLE 2.b
TITLE OF PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

TITLE	SIZE (Number of Employees) Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Manager, College Relations						2	2
Manager, Personnel			1				1
Manager, Employment				1			1
Manager, Corporate Placement				1			1
Manager, National Campus Recruitment					1		1
Manager, Employee Relations					1		1
Manager, Recruiting and College Relations					1		1
Manager, Corporate Staffing						1	1
Director, Human Resources Development					1		1
Director, Administration		1					1
Asst. V.P., Personnel		1					1
College Relations Representative				1			1
Corporate Recruiter					1		1
Supervisor, Special Recruiting Programs					1		1
Staffing Administrator				1			1
TOTAL	0	2	1	4	6	3	16

Table 2.c shows the titles of the person to whom the corporate college relations/recruiting coordinator reports. Again, a wide variety of titles are apparent.

TABLE 2.c
TITLE OF PERSON TO WHOM CORPORATE COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING COORDINATOR REPORTS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
V.P., Human Resources			1		2		3
Executive V.P.		2					2
Manager, Personnel				1	1		2
Manager, Employment				1			1
Manager, Corporate Staffing					1		1
Manager, Selection and Career Development					1		1
Manager, Professional Placement						1	1
Manager, Human Resources Planning and Employment						1	1
Director, Human Resources Planning and Development						1	1
Director, Personnel Administration					1		1
Director, Employee Relations				1			1
Supervisor, Professional Employment				1			1
TOTAL	0	2	1	4	6	3	16

Respondents were further asked to indicate which of three organizational patterns best described their college relations and recruiting activities: Centralized (all handled at the corporate level); Combination (coordinated at the corporate level but work carried out at operating unit level); or, Decentralized (all handled at operating unit level). Table 2.d shows that among responding firms the combination approach to college relations and recruiting is followed by the majority of firms (12).

TABLE 2.d
ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE
RELATIONS/RECRUITING FUNCTION

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
ORGANIZATION	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Centralized	0	1	0	1	2	0	4
Combination	0	1	1	3	3	4	12
Decentralized	1	1	0	1	1	0	4
TOTAL	1	3	1	5	6	4	20

In terms of staffing for college relations and recruiting, firms were asked to indicate both the number of persons who devote a majority of their time to the function and the number who devote a lesser amount of time (e.g., personnel who conduct campus interviews). Tables 2.e and 2.f show the responses and point out the relationship between size of firm and number of personnel involved (both full- and part-time). Except for the smaller firms (where most part-time staff come from personnel) the majority of part-time staff were drawn from areas other than personnel.

TABLE 2.e
NUMBER OF PERSONS DEVOTING A MAJORITY OF TIME TO
COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0		2		3			5
1		1	1		1		3
2	1			2	4	3	10
4					1		1
5						1	1
TOTAL	1	3	1	5	6	4	20

TABLE 2.f
NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL DEVOTING SOME TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0					1		1
1	1	1		1			3
3		1					1
4					1		1
5				1			1
7				1			1
10			1				1
11					1		1
12		1					1
15					1		1
17				1			1
20						1	1
30					1		1
47				1			1
65						1	1
85						1	1
100						1	1
TOTAL	1	3	1	5	5	4	19

EVALUATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

All firms responded to the item "Are there criteria by which the performance of your college relations/recruiting program is evaluated?" Twelve firms responded affirmatively and eight indicated there were no performance criteria. Of the criteria cited by respondents, the meeting of hiring quotas or maintaining a strong offer to hire ratio was cited by 11 firms, the quality of candidates hired by four firms and cost per hire by two firms.

ACTIVITIES UTILIZED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Seventeen different activities associated with college relations/recruiting were listed on the survey form and respondents were asked to indicate those activities their firm engaged in and those which were considered high priority. Table 3 reports the findings.

Providing printed recruiting material (all 20 firms), participating in campus career days (18 firms), cultivating key faculty/staff contacts and summer hiring of students (15 firms each), providing speakers to faculty or student organizations (14 firms), and hiring students through co-op or intern programs (12 firms) were the most popular activities. One-half of the firms (10) also made cash or equipment contributions to selected campuses. No single activity was listed as a high priority by a majority of the firms.

TABLE 3
ACTIVITIES NORMALLY USED IN
COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Printed recruiting material	1	3	1	5	6 (2)	4 (1)	20 (3)
Audio/visual recruiting material			1	2	3 (2)	2 (1)	8 (3)
Cultivating key faculty/staff contacts		2	1 (1)	3 (1)	5	4 (2)	15 (4)
Cultivating key student contacts			1 (1)		2	3	6 (1)
Providing speakers to faculty or student organizations		1		4	5 (1)	4	14 (1)
Scholarships or grants awarded to an academic department or institution to support student aid (based on either academic performance or financial need)			1	2	2	2	7
Summer hiring of students	1	2	1	3	5	3	15
Summer hiring of faculty							0

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Participating in campus career days	1	2		5 (1)	6	4 (1)	18 (2)
Hiring students through co-op, intern or other similar programs sponsored by a campus	1	3		3	4	1	12
Conferences or seminars for placement personnel and faculty at your expense				1	1	2	4
Contribution of cash or equipment to selected campuses		1	1	2	2	4	10
Sponsorship of student or faculty projects, such as research		1		1		2	4
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students at professional conferences			1		2	1	4
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students while you are on campus	1		1 (1)	2(1)	2	2	8 (2)

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Gifts of advertising materials, e.g., pens, lighters, desk accessories, etc.				3	1	1	5
Advertising through campus newspapers	1		1	2	1	2	7

*First number represents frequency of use while number in parentheses represents high priority activity as indicated by respondents.

Another way of getting at high priority activities was to ask firms to indicate what they considered the single most important thing they could do to assure productive recruiting year in and year out. The importance of maintaining good relationships and communications with campuses was listed by nine of the respondents while honesty in communicating needs and maintaining quality professional recruiters were each mentioned by two firms.

Employers were asked to indicate whether they ever utilized hiring bonuses or other incentives in hiring new college graduates or whether they ever utilized agencies or search firms for hiring new graduates. All 20 participating employers responded "No" to each question.

Similarly, employers were asked whether they utilized external consultants to review college relations/recruiting operations or to train staff. Only three firms reported using external consultants. Concerning the existence of formal training programs for personnel who conduct campus interviews, only eight of the 20 firms offered such training. (See Table 4.)

TABLE 4
FORMAL INTERVIEWER TRAINING PROGRAM*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
PROGRAM	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	0	1	0	2	1	4	8
NO	1	2	1	3	5	0	12
TOTAL	1	3	1	5	6	4	20

*Of those having formal interviewer training programs, the programs ranged in length from two to 16 hours and averaged 6.1 hours.

COST PER NEW GRADUATE HIRED

Twelve firms reported the average cost (out-of-pocket expense excluding salaries of staff) per new graduate hired. The range was from $300 to $4,500 and the median $1,500.

FREQUENCY OF HIRING QUOTA REVIEW

Two of the participating firms indicated that they did not have hiring quotas, however, the remaining 18 did and reported the frequency with which reviews were conducted. The largest number (eight) reported annual review while four reviewed on a quarterly basis, two each on semi-annual and as-needed basis, and one each on tri-annual and monthly bases.

Several items relating to change in the college relation/recruiting function over time were included in the survey. Tables 5 through 8 report the responses.

TABLE 5
GREATEST CHANGES NOTED OVER PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
Increased demand for high tech/top graduates	3
Placement services better organized/more helpful	2
Increased emphasis on pre-recruiting activity	2
Better forecasting of manpower needs	1
More companies recruiting	1

(Continued)

Table 5 (Continued)

Change	Frequency
Graduates more career-oriented	1
Graduates better prepared for job search	1
Better counseling at colleges	1
Demand has become cyclical	1
More resume books/brochures being used by colleges	1
Larger placement offices have become "paper mills"	1
More women in job market	1
More MBAs in job market	1
Less competition for graduates	1

TABLE 6
GREATEST CHANGES TO BE MADE OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
Business will have to "educate" colleges to changes and help them prepare students to meet future needs	3
Control recruiting costs	2
Colleges must do better job preparing students for finding jobs	1
Colleges must do better job educating students about career opportunities	1
Better utilization of Liberal Arts graduates	1
Better preparation of students for work	1
More attention to dual career couples	1
Finding ways to maintain good college relations while at same time recruiting less	1
More computer use in recruiting	1
Adjusting to decreasing demand for increasing number of graduates	1
Adjusting to declining number of graduates	1
Better understanding of careers and organizations	1

TABLE 7
GREATEST PROBLEM (OTHER THAN ECONOMY) FACING EMPLOYERS OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
Lack of depth/quality in college curricula	3
Increased demand for technical graduates	3
Imbalance in supply vs. demand of graduates in certain fields	2
Preparing graduates to work in data processing/word processing environment	1
Students bypassing campus recruiting	1
The lack of career planning for freshman and sophomore students	1

TABLE 8
HAS YOUR ORGANIZATION HAD TO MAKE ANY DRASTIC CHANGES DUE TO THE CONDITIONS OF THE JOB MARKET OR DUE TO CHANGES IN RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATES?

Response*	Frequency
YES	5
NO	14

*Changes Made	Frequency
Escalate salaries	3
More rapid advancement	1
Visited more campuses	1
Visited fewer campuses	1

VOLUME OF RECRUITING ACTIVITY REPORTED

Table 9 presents the number of recent college graduates hired by participating firms from all sources (campus and non-campus) during the 1981-82 recruiting year.

TABLE 9
RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATE HIRES DURING 1981-82 RECRUITING YEAR

SIZE (Number of Employees)

	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
RANGE	8	2-22	20	20-73	20-60	115-145
AVERAGE	8	11	20	42	34	127

Firms were additionally asked to indicate the percent of hires from both campus and non-campus sources. Results were not consistently reported and no comparisons could be made. By comparing Tables 9 and 15 (total new graduate hires and total hires from campus recruiting, respectively), however, it is evident that most hires result from campus recruiting.

Tables 10 through 15 report campus recruiting activity (number of campuses visited, number of campus interviews conducted, number of candidates invited for second interviews, acceptance of invitation for second interview, employment offers made, and acceptances).

TABLE 10
NUMBER OF CAMPUSES VISITED FOR RECRUITING PURPOSES

SIZE (Number of Employees)

	Under 1,000	1,001-2,5000	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
CAMPUSES VISITED	2	3-21	6	5-62	16-48	41-100
AVERAGE	2	13	6	33	34	72

TABLE 11
NUMBER OF CANDIDATES INTERVIEWED DURING RECRUITING VISITS

SIZE (Number of Employees)

	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INTERVIEWS	20	25-365	150	100-3,600	570-757	1,676-3,862
AVERAGE	20	211	150	1,207	642	2,613

TABLE 12
CANDIDATES INVITED FOR SECOND INTERVIEWS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INVITATIONS	1	6-45		10-324	45-84	340-558
AVERAGE	1	25		120	68	467

TABLE 13
CANDIDATES ACCEPTING INVITATION FOR SECOND INTERVIEW

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
ACCEPTANCES	1	6-41		10-308	43-84	326-550
AVERAGE	1	22		111	67	441

TABLE 14
OFFERS OF EMPLOYMENT

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
OFFERS	1	4-32	50	5-133	25-45	77-264
AVERAGE	1	17	50	58	34	173

TABLE 15
HIRES RESULTING FROM CAMPUS RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
HIRES	1	2-16	17	4-88	20-32	40-135
AVERAGE	1	9	17	37	24	87

These tables represent the experience of participating firms from the food and beverage processing industry for the 1981-82 recruiting year. It is difficult to speculate on the effect the economy has had on the industry because responses are somewhat conflicting. For example, 11 firms reported hiring more graduates (one to 80 percent more with a median increase of 50 percent) than in 1980-81 while two firms reported no change and only two reported a decrease (five and 10 percent). Similarly, 11 firms report an increase in hiring in 1981-82 over the average of the previous five years (five to 200 percent increases with median increase at 25 percent) while only two firms reported a decline. On the other hand, nine firms reported recruiting at fewer campuses, four the same number, and six at more.

When asked to indicate the factors considered in determining whether a particular campus was included in campus recruiting, the quality of the academic program and graduates, offering majors sought, previous hiring success and location of the campus were most frequently mentioned. (See Table 16.)

TABLE 16
FACTORS DETERMINING WHETHER A PARTICULAR CAMPUS IS INCLUDED IN RECRUITING

Factor	Frequency
Quality of program/graduates	9
College offers majors sought	9
Previous success recruiting at college	8
Proximity of college to major locations	8
Past success of graduates with firm	1
Number of graduates available	1
Effectiveness/cooperation of placement staff	1

An attempt was made to determine whether terms of a job offer were negotiable. Table 17 shows the number of firms considering each term negotiable. It appears that starting date (all 20 firms) and deadline for response to offer (18 firms) are clearly considered negotiable.

TABLE 17
NEGOTIABLE TERMS OF A JOB OFFER

Term	Frequency
Starting date	20
Deadline for response to offer	18
Location of employment	2
Starting salary	2

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate the greatest changes noted in college graduates over the past five years. Table 18 summarizes the results.

TABLE 18
GREATEST CHANGES IN COLLEGE GRADUATES

Change	Frequency
Better prepared for job search	4
Clearer career objectives	3
Increased salary demands	2
More reluctant to relocate	2
More realistic about jobs	1
More aggressive in job search	1
Better informed about employer needs	1
More competitive	1
More practical	1
More mature	1
More experienced graduates available	1
Poorer verbal and writing skills	1
More concerned with personal needs than employer needs	1
More concerned with being able to get a job than with being educated	1
More variability in sophistication in graduates	1

GLASS, PAPER, PACKAGING, AND ALLIED PRODUCTS

Twenty-four firms in this industrial category participated in the study by returning completed forms. Table 1 presents the number of respondents by size of their organization.

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
NUMBER RESPONDING	2	3	2	1	9	7	24

RESPONSIBILITY FOR AND ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING

Twenty of the participating firms reported that there was a person at the corporate level responsible for all college relations/recruiting activities. (See Table 2.a.) Titles varied for those individuals (Table 2.b) as they did for the person to whom they reported (Table 2.c). Years of tenure in the college relations/recruiting position ranged from six months to nine years with the average being three years.

TABLE 2.a
IS THERE A PERSON AT THE CORPORATE LEVEL
RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL COLLEGE RELATIONS/
RECRUITING ACTIVITIES OF YOUR ORGANIZATION?

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
RESPONSE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	2	2	1	1	7	7	20
NO	0	1	1	0	2	0	4
TOTAL	2	3	2	1	9	7	24

TABLE 2.b
TITLE OF PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Manager, College Relations					1	5	6
Manager, Recruiting/Corporate Recruiting	1		1		2		4
Manager, Employment		1		1			2
Manager, Personnel					1		1
Manager, Industrial Relations	1						1
Manager, Salaried Employment					1		1
Manager, Human Resources						1	1
Manager, Management Development						1	1
Corporate Recruiting Specialist					1		1
Supervisor, Management Recruiting					1		1
Administrator, Personnel		1					1
TOTAL	2	2	1	1	7	7	20

TABLE 2.c
TITLE OF PERSON TO WHOM CORPORATE COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING COORDINATOR REPORTS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Director, Personnel Planning Development						3	3
Director, Personnel Relations		1			1		2
Director, Personnel Operations			1				1
Director, Personnel				1			1
Director, Corporate Employment					1		1
Director, Selection and Placement						1	1
Senior V.P.						1	1
V.P., Industrial Relations					1		1
V.P., Personnel	1						1
V.P., Salaried Personnel					1		1
V.P., Distribution	1						1
Manager, Employee Relations		1					1
Manager, Corporate Staffing					1		1
Manager, Management Development					1		1
Manager, Corp. Recruiting						1	1
Manager, Manpower and Government Compliance					1		1
TOTAL	2	2	1	1	7	6	19

Respondents were further asked to indicate which of three organizational patterns best described their college relations and recruiting activities: Centralized (all handled at the corporate level); Combination (coordinated at the corporate level but work carried out at operating unit level); or, Decentralized (all handled at operating unit level). Table 2.d shows that most companies have combination (12 firms) and centralized patterns (10 firms).

TABLE 2.d
ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING FUNCTION

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
ORGANIZATION	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Centralized	1	1	1	1	3	3	10
Combination	1	2	1	0	4	4	12
Decentralized	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
TOTAL	2	3	2	1	9	7	24

In terms of staffing for college relations and recruiting, firms were asked to indicate both the number of persons who devote a majority of their time to the function and the number who devote a lesser amount of time (e.g., personnel who conduct campus interviews). Tables 2.e and 2.f show the responses. Individuals who are engaged in college relations/recruiting on a part-time basis are drawn about equally from personnel and non-personnel areas.

TABLE 2.e
NUMBER OF PERSONS DEVOTING A MAJORITY OF TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	1	1	1		2		5
1		2		1	3	1	7
2	1		1		1	1	4
4					1	2	3
5						1	1
6					1		1
10						1	1
11						1	1
TOTAL	2	3	2	1	8	7	23

TABLE 2.f
NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL DEVOTING SOME TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0			1		1	1	3
3		1			2		3
4		1					1
5	1	1					2
6				1			1
12	1				1		2
15					1		1
17			1				1
20					1	1	2
25					1	1	2
45					1		1
75						1	1
115						1	1
250						1	1
TOTAL	2	3	2	1	8	6	22

EVALUATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

All firms responded to the item "Are there performance criteria by which your college relations/recruiting program is evaluated?" Seventeen of these firms indicated there were such criteria, and in most instances multiple criteria. All listed meeting hiring goals or quotas or number of hires while four firms each mentioned quality of hires and cost per hire, and three firms each listed offer to hire ratio, feedback from recruited students, and retention of recent hires.

ACTIVITIES UTILIZED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Seventeen different activities associated with college relations/ recruiting were listed on the survey form and respondents were asked to indicate those activities their firm engaged in and those which were considered high priority. Table 3 reports the findings.

The provision of printed recruiting material and cultivating key faculty/staff contacts were the most popular activities (22 firms each), followed by participating in campus career days (19 firms) and the summer hiring of students, hiring students through co-op or intern programs, and providing speakers to faculty or student organizations (17 firms each). No particular activity stands out as a high priority, however, cultivating key faculty/staff contacts was most frequently mentioned (10 firms) as a high priority.

TABLE 3
ACTIVITIES NORMALLY USED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Printed recruiting material	2 (2)	2	2	1 (1)	9 (3)	6 (1)	22 (7)
Audio/visual recruiting material	1		1		4	3	9
Cultivating key faculty/staff contacts	2 (1)	2	2	1 (1)	8 (5)	7 (3)	22 (10)
Cultivating key student contacts				1 (1)	5 (3)	7 (2)	13 (6)
Providing speakers to faculty or student organizations	1 (1)	1	1	1	6 (1)	7 (1)	17 (3)
Scholarships or grants awarded to an academic department or institution to support student aid (based on either academic performance or financial need)		1	1		3	7 (1)	12 (1)
Summer hiring of students		2	1	1	7 (1)	6 (1)	17 (2)
Summer hiring of faculty					1	1	2
Participating in campus career days	1	1	1	1	9	6 (1)	19 (1)

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Hiring students through co-op, intern or other similar programs sponsored by a campus	1	2		1	6 (1)	7	17 (1)
Conferences or seminars for placement personnel and faculty at your expense					2	3	5
Contributions of cash or equipment to selected campuses			2		6 (1)	5	13 (1)
Sponsorship of student or faculty projects, such as research					1	4	5
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students at professional conferences					1	4 (1)	5 (1)
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students while you are on campus		1	1		3 (1)	5 (1)	10 (2)
Gifts of advertising materials, e.g., pens, lighters, desk accessories, etc.					3	3	6

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Advertising through campus newspapers	2		1	1	4	3	11

*First number represents frequency of use while number in parentheses represents high priority activity as indicated by respondents.

Another way of assessing high priority activities was to ask firms to indicate what they considered the single most important thing they could do to assure productive recruiting year in and year out. The significance of maintaining good communication and relationships with campuses is clearly evident as 14 firms listed this as most important. Timely follow-up with candidates was mentioned by an additional three firms.

Employers were next asked whether they utilized either hiring bonuses or other incentives to new college graduates or whether they used agencies or search firms in hiring new graduates. Two firms indicated the use of bonuses or other incentives. One of the firms indicated they offered incentives to all graduates hired but did not indicate the type of incentive. In the case of the other firm, the incentive was a bonus paid for relocation. Only one firm reported using agencies or search firms for engineering, chemistry, and computer science majors and was willing to pay related fees.

Similarly, employers were asked whether they utilized external consultants to review college relations/recruiting operations or to train staff. Six firms reported the use of such consultants while 18 had not. Some firms (11) reported having a formal training program for personnel who would be engaged in campus interviewing. (See Table 4.)

TABLE 4
FORMAL INTERVIEWER TRAINING PROGRAMS*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
PROGRAM	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	1	0	0	1	3	6	11
NO	1	3	2	0	6	1	13
TOTAL	2	3	2	1	9	7	24

*Of those having formal training programs, the programs last from five to 32 hours with the average length being 14 hours. Larger employers were not only more likely to have a training program but the length was also substantially longer.

COST PER NEW GRADUATE HIRED

The average cost (out-of-pocket expense excluding salaries of staff) per new graduate hired was reported by ten firms and ranged from $1,000 to $4,500 with a median cost of $2,400. Many firms did not report cost figures or did not have them available in the form requested.

FREQUENCY OF HIRING QUOTA REVIEW

All firms reported periodic review of hiring quotas with annual reviews most frequently reported. Four firms review on a monthly basis, three quarterly, two as needed, and one semi-annually.

Several items related to change in the college relations/recruiting function over time were included in the survey. Tables 5 through 8 report the results.

TABLE 5
GREATEST CHANGES NOTED OVER PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
Recruiting more competitive, especially for technical graduates	3
Escalation in salaries to technical graduates	3
More pre-recruiting methods used	2
Recruiting more professional/better organized	2
Increased use of EDP in recruiting	2

(Continued)

Table 5 (Continued)

Change	Frequency
Quality of placement offices better	2
Graduates more selective	2
Increase in number of co-op students	1
Colleges more public relations conscious	1
Shift away from Ivy League colleges to more local schools	1
Graduates better prepared academically	1
Graduates less mobile	1
Graduates better prepared for job search	1
Proliferation of government regulations	1
Increase in number of graduates available	1
Change itself	1

TABLE 6
GREATEST CHANGES TO BE MADE OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
Must become more cost-effective	4
More computer use in recruiting	3
More emphasis on pre-recruiting high tech graduates	2
Increase in competition for high tech graduates	2
Declining number of high tech graduates	1
Finding ways to match needs to supply	1
Scaling down of recruiting efforts	1
Increase of Liberal Arts graduates in market with some business courses	1
Better trained personnel for technical recruiting	1
Finding alternate support for colleges	1

TABLE 7
GREATEST PROBLEM (OTHER THAN ECONOMY) FACING EMPLOYERS OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Problem	Frequency
Over-supply of some graduates/maintaining right "mix" of graduates	4
Inefficient, antiquated placement services	1
Finding sources other than campuses for talent needed	1
Maintaining quality in college education	1

(Continued)

Table 7 (Continued)

Problem	Frequency
Shortage of technical graduates	1
Shortage of PhD engineering faculty	1
Long-range manpower planning	1
Degree of competition for graduates	1
Ability of small companies to remain competitive, especially for minorities	1
Shortage of minority candidates	1
Establishing selection criteria	1

TABLE 8
HAS YOUR ORGANIZATION HAD TO MAKE ANY DRASTIC CHANGES DUE TO THE CONDITION OF THE JOB MARKET OR DUE TO CHANGES IN RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATES?

Response*	Frequency
YES	10
NO	14

*Changes made	Frequency
Salary escalation	1
Cut recruiting costs	2
More thorough screening	2
Reduce recruiting efforts	1
Recruit regionally	1
Deal with dual career couples	1
Fewer jobs available	1
More in-house training offered	1

Because of the small number of firms providing any single response, it is difficult to identify trends. If anything, many responses are contradictory of other responses.

VOLUME OF RECRUITING ACTIVITY REPORTED

Table 9 reports the number of recent college graduate hires made by reporting firms during the 1981-82 recruiting year from all sources (campus and non-campus).

TABLE 9
RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATE HIRES DURING 1981-82 RECRUITING YEAR

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
RANGE	2-18	5-8	5-9	10	0-130	23-189
AVERAGE	10	6	7	10	26	80

Firms were additionally asked to indicate the percent of hires from both campus and non-campus sources, however, figures were inconsistently reported and results could not be presented. A comparison of Table 9 (hires from all sources) and Table 15 (hires resulting from campus recruiting) shows that the vast majority of new graduates hired during 1981-82 were through campus recruiting.

Tables 10 through 15 report campus recruiting activity (number of campuses visited, number of campus interviews conducted, number of candidates invited for second interviews, acceptances of invitation for second interview, employment offers, and acceptances).

TABLE 10
NUMBER OF CAMPUSES VISITED FOR RECRUITING PURPOSES

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
CAMPUSES VISITED	2-11	3-13	8-11	28	11-65	32-114
AVERAGE	7	7	10	28	27	65

TABLE 11
NUMBER OF CANDIDATES INTERVIEWED DURING RECRUITING VISITS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INTERVIEWS	25-720	45-153	64	700	92-3,000	862-4,640
AVERAGE	373	83	64	700	732	2,343

TABLE 12
CANDIDATES INVITED FOR SECOND INTERVIEWS

SIZE (Number of Employees)

	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INVITATIONS	4-92	5-23	10	50	5-450	53-1,027
AVERAGE	48	13	10	50	125	471

TABLE 13
CANDIDATES ACCEPTING INVITATION FOR SECOND INTERVIEW

SIZE (Number of Employees)

	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
ACCEPTANCES	4-86	5-22	10	40	5-425	80-666
AVERAGE	45	12	10	40	113	347

TABLE 14
OFFERS OF EMPLOYMENT

SIZE (Number of Employees)

	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
OFFERS	3-24	3-13	3	18	2-161	26-351
AVERAGE	14	7	3	18	44	156

TABLE 15
HIRES RESULTING FROM CAMPUS RECRUITING

SIZE (Number of Employees)

	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
HIRES	2-18	2-8	2	10	0-108	10-134
AVERAGE	10	5	2	10	26	73

These tables provide readers with average figures which represent the experience of the participating firms during the 1981-82 recruiting year. In addition to these data, seven firms reported an increase in new college graduate hires over 1980-81 hiring levels, three firms reported no change, and 11 firms reported a decline in hiring over 1980-81 levels (-15 to -70 percent with the median decline at -25 percent). Similarly, four firms reported an increase in hiring during 1981-82 compared with the average of the previous five years, one indicated no change, and eight reported a decline of from -15 to -70 percent (median decline was -25 percent). The decline in hiring was also reflected in the number of campuses visited for recruiting purposes where 11 of the firms reported a decline while seven remained the same and six increased.

When asked to indicate the factors considered in determining whether a particular campus was included in campus recruiting, the principal reasons cited were campus location (15), quality of program/students (13), offers majors sought (12), and prior success recruiting at college (10). Table 16 presents the complete findings.

TABLE 16
FACTORS DETERMINING WHETHER A PARTICULAR CAMPUS IS INCLUDED IN RECRUITING

Factor	Frequency
Proximity to major locations	15
Quality of program/students	13
College offers majors sought	12
Prior success recruiting at college	10
Performance of previous hires from college	3
Number of minority graduates	2
Number of graduates available	1
Quality of placement service	1
Does college offer internship opportunities?	1

An attempt was made to determine the extent to which certain terms of a job offer might be negotiable. Table 17 shows the number of firms considering each term negotiable.

TABLE 17
NEGOTIABLE TERMS OF A JOB OFFER

Term	Frequency
Starting date	23
Deadline for response to offer	18
Starting salary	5
Location of employment	3

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate the greatest changes noted in college graduates over the past five years. Table 18 summarizes the results.

TABLE 18
GREATEST CHANGES IN COLLEGE GRADUATES

Change	Frequency
Better prepared for getting job	4
Higher GPAs (inflated?)	3
More serious	2
More business-oriented	2
More mature in judgment	2
More pragmatic	1
More assertive	1
More job/goal oriented	1
More realistic regarding salary	1
More conservative	1
Better prepared for business	1
Academic preparation poorer	1
Poor verbal/writing skills	1
Less realistic about industry	1
Greater interest in quality of life issues	1
More impatient about career progression	1

METALS AND METAL PRODUCTS

Forty-five firms in the metals and metal products industries participated in this study by returning completed forms. Table 1 presents the number of firms by size.

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
NUMBER RESPONDING	7	5	6	10	5	12	45

RESPONSIBILITY FOR AND ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING

All but five firms reported that there was a person at the corporate level responsible for all college relations/recruiting activities. (See Table 2.a.) Titles for both the person responsible for college relations/recruiting and the person to whom he or she reports vary considerably. Years of tenure in the college relations/recruiting coordinator's position vary from one to 20 years with the average being 4.4 years.

TABLE 2.a
IS THERE A PERSON AT THE CORPORATE LEVEL RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL COLLEGE RELATIONS/ RECRUITING ACTIVITIES OF YOUR ORGANIZATION?

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
RESPONSE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	5	5	6	7	5	12	40
NO	2	0	0	3	0	0	5
TOTAL	7	5	6	10	5	12	45

TABLE 2.b
TITLE OF PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

TITLE	SIZE (Number of Employees) Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Manager, College Relations				1	2	2	5
Manager, Employment		1	2				3
Manager, Personnel	2			1			3
Manager, Corporate Personnel	1	1					2
Manager, Recruiting		1					1
Manager, Management Development			1				1
Manager, Employee Relations				1			1
Manager, Employment and EEO				1			1
Manager, College Recruiting						2	2
Manager, Personnel and Training						1	1
Mgr., Human Resources	1						1
Manager, Employment and Training	1						1
Manager, Salaried Employment						1	1
Manager, Manpower and Placement						1	1
Manager, Corporate Employee Relations						1	1

(Continued)

Table 2.b (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
V.P., Personnel and Industrial Relations				1			1
Director, Personnel			1				1
Director, Technical Employment					1		1
Director, Training and Recruiting		1					1
Director, Employment and Planning						1	1
Sr. Coordinator, College Relations						1	1
Sr. Employment Representative				1	1		2
Coordinator, Corporate Recruiting						1	1
Supervisor, Employment			1				1
Supervisor, Corporate Staffing					1		1
Employment Representative		1		1			2
Employment Specialist			1				1
TOTAL	5	5	6	7	5	11	39

TABLE 2.c
TITLE OF PERSON TO WHOM CORPORATE COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING COORDINATOR REPORTS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
President and Chief Executive Officer				1			1
President	1						1
V.P., Administration	1						1
V.P., Human Resources	2						2
V.P., Employee Relations		1		1			2
V.P., Finance	1						1
V.P., Sales		1					1
V.P. and Secretary			1				1
V.P., Industrial Relations					1	1	2
V.P., Industrial and Employee Relations						1	1
Vice President				1			1
Manager, Manufacturing		1					1
Manager, Employment			1	1			2
Manager, Personnel					1		1
Manager, Salaried Personnel			1		1		2
Manager, Corporate Employment						1	1
Manager, Corporate Staffing					1		1
Manager, Human Resources			1				1

(Continued)

Table 2.c (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Manager, Management Personnel Planning						1	1
Manager, Personnel and Industrial Relations						1	1
Supervisor, Personnel Development		1					1
Administrator, Employment and EEO				1			1
Group Personnel Director						1	1
Director, Personnel		1		1		4	6
Director, Industrial Relations			1				1
Director, Human Resources						1	1
Director, Employee Relations				1			1
Director, Human Resources Planning					1		1
TOTAL	5	5	5	7	5	11	38

Respondents were further asked to indicate which of three organizational patterns best described their college relations and recruiting activities: Centralized (all handled at the corporate level); Combination (coordinated at the corporate level but work carried out at operating unit level); or, Decentralized (all work handled at operating unit level). Table 2.d shows that centralized (19) and combination (21) patterns are followed by most organizations. The combination pattern is followed most frequently by larger firms while both the centralized and decentralized patterns are more likely to be found among smaller firms.

TABLE 2.d
ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING FUNCTION

SIZE (Number of Employees)

ORGANIZATION	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Centralized	3	3	4	4	2	3	19
Combination	1	1	1	6	3	9	21
Decentralized	3	1	1	0	0	0	5
TOTAL	7	5	6	10	5	12	45

In terms of staffing for college relations and recruiting, firms were asked to indicate both the number of persons who devote a majority of their time to the function and the number who devote a lesser amount of time (e.g., personnel who conduct campus interviews). Tables 2.e and 2.f show the responses and point out a direct relationship between firm size and number of personnel involved (both full- and part-time). Most of the firms reported that a majority of part-time college relations and recruiting staff were drawn from operating areas other than personnel.

TABLE 2.e
NUMBER OF PERSONS DEVOTING A MAJORITY OF TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

SIZE (Number of Employees)

NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	4	3	2	3	2		14
1	3	2	4	6	1	2	18
2				1	1		2
3						1	1
4						2	2
5					1	3	4
9						1	1
10						2	2
36						1	1
TOTAL	7	5	6	10	5	12	45

TABLE 2.f
NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL DEVOTING SOME TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	1	1					2
1	2	1		1			4
2	1	1			1		3
3			2	3	1	2	8
4	1	1		1			3
5				1	1		2
6				2		1	3
7			1				1
8	1		1	1			3
10		1	2			1	4
12						1	1
15				1			1
20					1	1	2
25						1	1
60						1	1
75						1	1
80						2	2
110					1		1
130						1	1
TOTAL	6	5	6	10	5	12	44

EVALUATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Thirty-one firms indicated that there were criteria by which the performance of college relations/recruiting was judged. Most firms cited multiple criteria. The criteria most frequently mentioned were number of hires or meeting hiring goals/quotas (14 firms), quality/performance of hires and ratio of offers to hires (13 firms each), and cost per hire (five firms). Generally speaking, larger firms were more likely to evaluate the college relations/recruiting operation than were smaller firms.

ACTIVITIES UTILIZED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Seventeen different activities associated with college relations/recruiting were listed on the survey form and respondents were asked to indicate the activities their firm engaged in and those which were considered high priority. Table 3 reports the findings.

The provision of printed recruiting material was the activity engaged in by the most firms (39), followed by cultivating key faculty/staff contacts and hiring students through co-op or intern programs (35 each), participating in campus career days (32), providing speakers to faculty or student organizations (30), and summer hiring of students (28). Activities most frequently identified as priorities were printed recruiting material and cultivating key faculty/staff contacts (13 each) and hiring students through co-op or intern programs (10).

TABLE 3
ACTIVITIES NORMALLY USED
IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Printed recruiting Material	7 (1)	3 (2)	5 (2)	10 (2)	2 (1)	12 (5)	39 (13)
Audio/visual recruiting material	2		1	1		5	9
Cultivating key faculty/staff contacts	3	3 (1)	6 (2)	9 (6)	2 (1)	12 (3)	35 (13)
Cultivating key student contacts		1	2	5 (2)	1	10 (2)	19 (4)
Providing speakers to faculty or student organizations	3	3 (1)	4	7 (1)	1	12	30 (2)
Scholarships or grants awarded to an academic department or institution to support student aid (based on either academic performance or financial need)		1 (1)	3 (2)	2		8	14 (3)

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Summer hiring of students	4	2	2 (1)	10 (2)		10 (4)	28 (7)
Summer hiring of faculty						5	5
Participating in campus career days	5 (1)	3	6 (1)	8	1 (1)	9	32 (3)
Hiring students through co-op, intern or other similar programs sponsored by a campus	7 (1)	3	5 (1)	7 (2)	2 (1)	11 (5)	35 (10)
Conferences or seminars for placement personnel and faculty at your expense			1	2		3 (1)	6 (1)
Contributions of cash or equipment to selected campuses		1	2	5		8 (3)	16 (3)
Sponsorship of student or faculty projects, such as research	1			2		6 (1)	9 (1)
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students at professional conferences		1		2		5	8

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students while you are on campus	2		3	3 (1)	1 (1)	8 (1)	17 (3)
Gifts of advertising materials, e.g., pens, lighters, desk accessories, etc.		1	1		1 (1)	4	7 (1)
Advertising through campus newspapers	2	2		4 (1)		4	12 (1)

*First number represents frequency of use while number in parentheses represents high priority activity as indicated by respondents.

Another way of assessing high priority activities was to ask firms to indicate what they considered the single most important thing they could do to assure productive recruiting year in and year out. The importance of maintaining strong campus contacts and communication stands out as 26 of the participating firms list this as most important (the only thing listed by more than three firms).

Firms were asked whether they offered bonuses or other incentives to new college graduates or whether they utilized agencies or search firms in hiring new graduates. Only two responded that they offered bonuses or other incentives (to engineering candidates only) while two also reported using agencies or search firms for new graduates (again, for engineers only). Both of the latter firms indicated they paid the agencies' fees.

Employers were also asked whether they ever utilized external consultants to review college relations/recruiting operations or to train their recruiting staff. Five firms reported the use of such consultants. Only 11 firms reported that they offered formal training for personnel engaged in campus recruiting (all had 5,000 employees or more). None of the firms under 5,000 employees provided interviewer training. Table 4 presents the complete findings.

TABLE 4
FORMAL INTERVIEWER TRAINING PROGRAMS*

SIZE (Number of Employees)

PROGRAM	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	0	0	0	1	2	8	11
NO	7	5	6	9	3	4	34
TOTAL	7	5	6	10	5	12	45

*Of those firms having formal training programs, the programs lasted from three to 40 hours and averaged 15 hours in length.

COST PER NEW GRADUATE HIRED

Twenty-four firms provided average cost of hiring figures. The cost ranged from $100 to $3,550 per hire with the median cost at $1,400.

FREQUENCY OF HIRING QUOTA REVIEW

All but three firms reported periodic review of hiring quotas. Most reviewed only on an annual basis while seven reviewed semi-annually, five quarterly, four monthly, one weekly, one constantly, and two as needed.

Several items relating to change in the college relations/recruiting function over time were included in the study and results are reported in Tables 5 through 8

TABLE 5
GREATEST CHANGES NOTED OVER PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
Increased competition for technical graduates	10
Greater use of pre-screening	4
Increased emphasis on college relations	3
Salary escalation	2
Companies more marketing conscious	2
Greater professionalism among recruiters	2
More efficient/professional placement offices	2
Recruiting has become impersonal	1
Less effort placed in recruiting (less demand)	1

(Continued)

Table 5 (Continued)

Change	Frequency
More line staff involved in recruiting	1
Better quality graduates	1
Better attitude on part of graduates	1
Graduates more serious	1
Graduates more communicative	1
Graduates better prepared for job search	1
More emphasis on minorities and women	1
More of buyers market	1
Placement has become big business	1
More colleges courting companies	1
More use of computers	1

TABLE 6
GREATEST CHANGES TO BE MADE OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
More cost-effective recruiting	6
Increased competition for technical graduates	3
More pre-recruiting/pre-screening	3
Better prepared college relations personnel	3
Adjusting to reduced supply of graduates	3
Graduates will be better prepared for entry into business world	2
Adjusting to fluctuating economy	2
Increasing surplus of business graduates	1
More dual career couples	1
More graduates bypassing campus recruiting	1
More co-op and intern programs	1
More industry support to colleges	1
More competition for top graduates	1
More computerization	1
Closer relationships between colleges and companies	1
Placement will become more employer-oriented	1

TABLE 7
GREATEST PROBLEM (OTHER THAN ECONOMY) FACING EMPLOYERS OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Problem	Frequency
Competition for technical graduates	8
Decline in number of talented graduates	4
Escalating salaries/salary compression	3
Decline in number of technical graduates	3
Maintaining quality contacts with colleges	3
Providing challenge/growth to new hires	2
Effective manpower planning	2
Too many in middle management--limits growth opportunities	1
Tougher competition for small to medium size companies	1
Use of third party placement	1
Increased competition from other industries	1
Not enough opportunities for generalists	1
Preparing graduates for reality	1
Decline in total number of graduates	1
Maintaining budget support	1
Maintaining professional standards	1
Cost control	1
Lack of mobility in graduates	1
Decline in professional standards in placement	1

TABLE 8
HAS YOUR ORGANIZATION HAD TO MAKE ANY DRASTIC CHANGES DUE TO THE CONDITION OF THE JOB MARKET OR DUE TO CHANGES IN RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATES?

Response*	Frequency
YES	15
NO	26

*Changes made	Frequency
Escalate salaries/salary compression	9
More thorough screening	5
Suspend/reduce recruiting	2
Offer hiring bonus	1
Reduce hiring	1
Offer more time-off	1

VOLUME OF RECRUITING ACTIVITY REPORTED

Table 9 reports the number of recent college graduate hires made by reporting firms during the 1981-82 recruiting year. These figures represent hires from all sources (campus and non-campus).

TABLE 9
RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATE HIRES
DURING 1981-82 RECRUITING YEAR

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
RANGE	0-6	2-9	4-27	0-25	3-172	0-450
AVERAGE	3	6	13	9	48	148

Firms were additionally asked to indicate the percent of hires from both campus and non-campus sources, however, figures were inconsistently reported and results could not be presented. A comparison of Table 9 (hires from all sources) and Table 15 (hires resulting from campus recruiting) shows that the vast majority of new graduates hired during 1981-82 were through campus recruiting.

Tables 10 through 15 report campus recruiting activity (number of campuses visited, number of campus interviews conducted, number of candidates invited for second interviews, acceptances of invitation for second interview, employment offers, and acceptances).

TABLE 10
NUMBER OF CAMPUSES VISITED
FOR RECRUITING PURPOSES

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
CAMPUSES VISITED	0-11	1-34	4-58	0-24	9-60	0-160
AVERAGE	4	14	34	10	24	77

TABLE 11
NUMBER OF CANDIDATES INTERVIEWED DURING RECRUITING VISITS

SIZE (Number of Employees)

	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INTERVIEWS	4-177	24-733	48-684	78-600	115-1,912	446-5,600
AVERAGE	76	243	392	276	703	2,237

TABLE 12
CANDIDATES INVITED FOR SECOND INTERVIEWS

SIZE (Number of Employees)

	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INVITATIONS	2-35	6-56	12-102	8-87	8-812	45-1,760
AVERAGE	13	30	59	46	185	639

TABLE 13
CANDIDATES ACCEPTING INVITATION FOR SECOND INTERVIEW

SIZE (Number of Employees)

	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
ACCEPTANCES	2-32	6-54	12-87	7-69	8-623	20-1,225
AVERAGE	12	28	54	40	146	461

TABLE 14
OFFERS OF EMPLOYMENT

SIZE (Number of Employees)

	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
OFFERS	0-10	3-23	4-36	3-28	5-309	4-500
AVERAGE	4	10	17	12	72	237

TABLE 15
HIRES RESULTING FROM CAMPUS RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
HIRES	0-8	2-9	4-22	2-8	3-172	2-225
AVERAGE	3	6	11	5	39	104

These tables summarize the experience of metals and metal products firms of various size in college recruiting during the 1981-82 recruiting year. The firms were further asked to indicate how the number of hires during 1981-82 compared with 1980-81. Thirty-three firms provided comparative figures and 19 were found to have decreased hiring from -1 to -100 percent (median decrease was -50 percent). On the other hand, six firms reported no change and only eight reported an increase (10 to 500 percent: median increase was 50 percent). A comparison of 1981-82 hires with the average hires of the previous five years found similar results. In terms of campus recruiting, 21 firms reported a reduction in the number of colleges recruited, 13 recruited at the same number, and 11 recruited at more.

When asked to indicate the factors considered in determining whether a particular campus was included in campus recruiting, four primary factors were listed: college offers majors needed (30 firms), quality of program/students (23 firms), location (22 firms), and past success recruiting at the college (19 firms). Table 16 presents the complete findings.

TABLE 16
FACTORS DETERMINING WHETHER A PARTICULAR CAMPUS IS INCLUDED IN RECRUITING

Factor	Frequency
College offers majors sought	30
Quality of program/graduates	23
Proximity of college to major locations	22
Past success recruiting at college	19
Number of graduates	3
Cost per hire	2
Relationship with placement staff	2
Success of prior graduates with company	1

An attempt was made to determine the extent to which certain terms of a job offer might be negotiable. Table 17 shows the number of firms considering each term negotiable. It appears that starting date and deadline for response are almost universally negotiable.

TABLE 17
NEGOTIABLE TERMS OF A JOB OFFER

Term	Frequency
Starting date	42
Deadline for response to offer	40
Starting salary	8
Location of employment	5

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate the greatest changes noted in college graduates over the past five years. Table 18 reports the varied and sometimes conflicting responses.

TABLE 18
GREATEST CHANGES IN COLLEGE GRADUATES

Change	Frequency
More career-oriented	4
More mature	4
Better prepared for job search	4
More salary conscious	3
More interest in quality of life issues	3
Stronger work ethic	3
Generally poorer quality	3
Less mobile	3
More women in business/non-traditional careers	2
More interested in business	2
More conservative	2
More realistic	1
More selective	1
More positive attitude	1
More sophisticated	1
More aggressive	1
Better prepared academically	1
Too much interest in MBA	1
More have some computer science background	1
More dual career couples	1
Greater sensitivity to people/environment	1

(Continued)

Table 18 (Continued)

Change	Frequency
Expectations unrealistic	1
Less prior work experience among advanced degree holders	1
Less career goals	1
Less team oriented	1
Less mature	1
Less enthusiastic	1

PETROLEUM AND ALLIED PRODUCTS (INCLUDING NATURAL GAS)

Thirty-seven firms participated in the study by returning completed forms. All size categories are represented. (See Table 1.)

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
NUMBER RESPONDING	3	7	8	3	5	11	37

RESPONSIBILITY FOR AND ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING

All but four participating firms reported that there was a person at the corporate level responsible for college relations/recruiting activities. (See Table 2.a.) Titles vary considerable for both the corporate officer responsible for college relations/recruiting (Table 2.b) and for the individual he/she reports to (Table 2.c). Years of tenure in the coordinating position varied from two months to 23 years with the average being 3.8 years.

TABLE 2.a
IS THERE A PERSON AT THE CORPORATE LEVEL RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL COLLEGE RELATIONS/ RECRUITING ACTIVITIES OF YOUR ORGANIZATION?

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
RESPONSE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	3	6	6	3	5	10	33
NO	0	1	2	0	0	1	4
TOTAL	3	7	8	3	5	11	37

TABLE 2.b
TITLE OF PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Vice President	1						1
V.P., Employee Relations					1		1
Manager, College Recruiting						2	2
Manager, Professional Employment						1	1
Manager, Employment		2	1		1		4
Manager, Corporate Employment						1	1
Manager, Corporate Placement			1				1
Manager, Professional Recruiting				1	1		2
Manager, Corporate College Relations				1			1
Manager, College Relations					1		1
Mgr., College Recruiting						2	2
Director, College Relations			1				1
Director, College Relations and Recruiting						1	1
Supervisor, College Relations and Recruiting		1					1
Supervisor, Employment			1	1			2

(Continued)

Table 2.b (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Supervisor, Professional Employment						1	1
Administrator, College Relations					1		1
Coordinator, Employment	1						1
Coordinator, Professional and Technical Recruiting						2	2
Senior Personnel Specialist		1					1
Employment Analyst	1						1
Employment Representative		1	1				2
Personnel Representative			1				1
Corporate Recruiter		1					1
TOTAL	3	6	6	3	5	10	33

TABLE 2.c
TITLE OF PERSON TO WHOM CORPORATE COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING COORDINATOR REPORTS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
President and CEO					1		1
President	1						1
V.P., Administration		1					1
V.P., Human Resources			1		1	1	3
Field Manager		1					1
Division Personnel Manager	1						1
Manager, Employment and EEO	1					1	2
Mgr., Employee Relations		1	1		1		3
Manager, Personnel			1	1			2
Manager, Employment Services			1				1
Manager, Corp. Recruiting				1			1
Manager, Professional Recruiting						1	1
Manager, Recruiting and Career Development						1	1
Manager, Corp. Staffing and Development						1	1
Manager, Management Planning and Development						1	1
Manager, Recruiting and Benefits		1					1
Senior Director						1	1

(Continued)

Table 2.c (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Director, Personnel		1			2		3
Director, Human Resources			1	1			2
Director, Selection Services						1	1
Director, Selection and Placement						1	1
Director, Training and Personnel Planning						1	1
Supervisor, Employment		1					1
Staffing Supervisor			1				1
TOTAL	3	6	6	3	5	10	33

Respondents were further asked to indicate which of three organizational patterns best described their college relations and recruiting activities: Centralized (all handled at the corporate level); Combination (coordinated at the corporate level but work carried out at operating unit level); or, Decentralized (all handled at operating unit level). Table 2.d shows that the combination approach is followed by the greatest number of firms (22).

TABLE 2.d
ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING FUNCTION

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
ORGANIZATION	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Centralized	1	3	3	0	0	4	11
Combination	2	3	4	3	5	5	22
Decentralized	0	1	1	0	0	2	4
TOTAL	3	7	8	3	5	11	37

In terms of staffing for college relations and recruiting, firms were asked to indicate both the number of persons who devote a majority of their time to the function and the number who devote a lesser amount of time (e.g., personnel who conduct campus interviews). Tables 2.e and 2.f show the responses and point out a direct relationship between firm size and number of personnel involved (both full- and part-time). Most of the firms reported that a majority of part-time college relations and recruiting staff were drawn from operating areas other than personnel.

TABLE 2.e
NUMBER OF PERSONS DEVOTING A MAJORITY OF TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	1	3	3				7
1	2	3	1		2	1	9
2			2	1	1	1	5
3		1		1			2
4			1			1	2
5			1	1	1		3
6						1	1
7					1	1	2
12						1	1
16						1	1
24						1	1
33						1	1
37						1	1
55						1	1
TOTAL	3	7	8	3	5	11	37

TABLE 2.f
NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL DEVOTING SOME TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001 2,500	2,501 5,000	5,001- 10,000	10,001- 20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0		1					1
1	1	1					2
2	1	3					4
3			1				1
5						1	1
6	1						1
9			2		1		3
10		1			1		2
15			3				3
20		1	1				2
35				1			1
40				1			1
41					1		1
50			1				1
57						1	1
70						1	1
78						1	1
100				1	2		3
185						1	1
200						1	1
250						1	1
300						2	2
353						1	1
600						1	1
TOTAL	3	7	8	3	5	11	37

EVALUATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Twenty-seven of the 37 firms participating indicated there were criteria by which the performance of their college relations/recruiting program was evaluated. Most frequently cited criteria were number of hires or meeting hiring quotas/goals (18), quality or performance of hires (seven), acceptance ratio (six), and candidate feedback (four).

ACTIVITIES UTILIZED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Seventeen different activities associated with college relations/recruiting were listed on the survey form and respondents were asked to indicate the activities their firm engaged in and those which were considered high priority. Table 3 reports the findings.

Providing printed recruiting material (35 firms), cultivating key faculty/staff contacts (34 firms), summer hiring of students (30 firms), contributions of cash or equipment to selected campuses (28 firms), and participating in campus career days (27 firms) were the most popular activities.

TABLE 3
ACTIVITIES NORMALLY USED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Printed recruiting material	2	7 (1)	8 (3)	3 (2)	5 (1)	10 (4)	35 (11)
Audio/visual recruiting material		2	3			5	10
Cultivating key faculty/staff contacts	2	7	7 (1)	3 (2)	4 (3)	11 (7)	34 (13)
Cultivating key student contacts	1	4 (1)	1	3	5 (1)	7 (4)	21 (6)
Providing speakers to faculty or student organizations		5	4	2 (1)		9 (1)	20 (2)
Scholarships or grants awarded to an academic department or institution to support student aid (based on either academic performance or financial need)	2	3 (1)	3	2	4 (3)	9 (4)	23 (8)

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Summer hiring of students	3	4 (3)	7 (2)	2 (1)	4 (2)	10 (5)	30 (13)
Summer hiring of faculty		1			2	4	7
Participating in campus career days	1	5 (1)	6	2 (1)	3	10 (1)	27 (3)
Hiring students through co-op, intern or other similar programs sponsored by a campus		4 (1)	3		3 (2)	7 (2)	17 (5)
Conferences or seminars for placement personnel and faculty at your expense			3 (1)	1		4	8 (1)
Contributions of cash or equipment to selected campuses	1	5 (1)	5	2	4 (1)	11 (3)	28 (5)
Sponsorship of student or faculty projects, such as research		1	4		2	6 (2)	13 (2)
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students at professional conferences		1	3	1	2 (1)	6 (1)	13 (2)

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students while you are on campus	1	4 (1)	2	2 (1)	4 (1)	7 (1)	20 (4)
Gifts of advertising materials, e.g., pens, lighters, desk accessories, etc.		1	2	2	1	3	9
Advertising through campus newspapers	1	3	7 (1)	1	2	5 (2)	19 (3)

*First number represents frequency of use while number in parentheses represents high priority activity as indicated by respondents.

Another way of identifying high priority activities was to ask firms what they considered to be the single most important thing they could do to assure productive recruiting year in and year out. A variety of responses was given, however, the only activity mentioned more than twice was maintaining good contacts and communication with campuses recruited (20 firms).

Employers were next asked whether they offered hiring bonuses or other incentives to new college graduates or whether they utilized agencies or search firms in hiring new graduates. Four firms indicated that they offered incentives (for engineers and MBAs only) and only two indicated they used agencies (for engineering, finance and accounting majors). Only one firm indicated that they paid agency fees.

Firms were also asked whether they ever used external consultants to review college relations/recruiting operations or to train personnel. Fourteen firms responded that they had used such consultants. Nineteen firms indicated that they offered a formal training program for personnel engaged in campus interviewing. (See Table 4.)

TABLE 4
FORMAL INTERVIEWER TRAINING PROGRAMS*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
PROGRAM	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	0	1	3	2	2	11	19
NO	3	6	5	1	3	0	18
TOTAL	3	7	8	3	5	11	37

*Of those having formal training programs, the programs last from three to 80 hours with average length being 17.3 hours.

COST PER NEW GRADUATE HIRED

The average cost (out-of-pocket expense excluding salaries of staff) per new graduate hired ranged from $280 to $5,000, with the median cost at $1,540.

FREQUENCY OF HIRING QUOTA REVIEW

All firms reported that periodic review of hiring quotas was conducted. Twenty firms reviewed on an annual basis, seven semi-annually, six quarterly, three monthly, and one as needed.

Several items relating to change in the college relations/recruiting function were included in the survey. Tables 5 through 8 report results.

TABLE 5
GREATEST CHANGES NOTED OVER PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
Increased competition for technical graduates	9
More emphasis on college relations and prerecruiting	3
Students better prepared for job search	3
Fluctuations in demand	3
Placement more professional/improved service	2
Graduates more sophisticated	2
Recruiting more critical than ever to employment efforts of firms	1
Salary inflation	1

(Continued)

Table 5 Continued

Change	Frequency
More co-op programs	1
Recruiting has become more professional	1
Increased emphasis on fall recruiting	1
Graduates have become spoiled by market	1
More competition for women and minorities	1
Increased number of graduates	1
Tighter recruiting budgets	1
Improved candidate attitudes	1
Graduates more selective	1
Graduates more conservative	1
Escalating recruiting costs	1

TABLE 6
GREATEST CHANGES TO BE MADE OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
Greater fluctuations in recruiting needs	3
Better communications between colleges and industry	3
More selectivity in recruiting	3
Recruiting must become more cost-effective	2
Colleges will become more marketing conscious	1
More pre-recruiting	1
More competitive recruiting	1
Adjusting to older work force--fewer new hires	1
More emphasis on career planning	1
More use of computers and media	1
More emphasis on placement by both employers and colleges	1
More management control of college relations/ recruiting	2
More emphasis on EEO compliance	1
More attention to salary inflation/compression	1
More financial support to colleges from industry	1

TABLE 7
GREATEST PROBLEM (OTHER THAN ECONOMY) FACING EMPLOYERS OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Problem	Frequency
Imbalances between supply and demand	6
Salary inflation/compression	3
Poor manpower planning	2
Providing challenge to new graduates	2
Decrease in engineering graduates	2
Decrease in engineering faculty	2
Remaining cost-effective	2
Lack of good information by decision makers (college deans and corporate managers)	1
Providing better placement systems	1
Encroachment by third party recruiters	1
Adequate funding for colleges	1
Competition of experienced candidates with new graduates for entry jobs	1
Increased competition between companies for same graduates	1
Screening out the unqualified	1
How to utilize generalists	1

TABLE 8
HAS YOUR ORGANIZATION HAD TO MAKE ANY DRASTIC CHANGES DUE TO THE CONDITION OF THE JOB MARKET OR DUE TO CHANGES IN RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATES?

Response*	Frequency
YES	15
NO	22

*Changes Made	Frequency
Escalate salaries/salary compression	4
More thorough screening	2
Eliminate or reduce recruiting	2
Reduce hiring	1
Reduce staff	1
Reduce budget	1
Add relocation expenses	1
Speed up salary increases	1

VOLUME OF RECRUITING ACTIVITY REPORTED

Table 9 reports the number of recent college graduate hires made by participating firms from all sources during the 1981-82 recruiting year.

TABLE 9
RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATE HIRES DURING 1981-82 RECRUITING YEAR

SIZE (Number of Employees)

	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
RANGE	3-14	0-80	12-73	42-106	27-459	20-696
AVERAGE	9	29	40	83	173	402

Firms were also asked to indicate the percent of hires from both campus and non-campus sources, however, because of inconsistency in responses, the results could not be reported. By comparing Table 9 (total new graduate hires) with Table 15 (hires resulting from campus recruiting) it is evident that the vast majority of new hires came through the campus recruiting route.

Tables 10 through 15 report campus recruiting activity (number of campuses visited, number of campus interviews conducted, number of candidates invited for second interviews, acceptances of invitation for second interview, employment offers, and acceptances.

TABLE 10
NUMBER OF CAMPUSES VISITED FOR RECRUITING PURPOSES

SIZE (Number of Employees)

	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
CAMPUSES VISITED	8-14	7-35	6-42	35-63	11-107	43-215
AVERAGE	11	16	24	51	47	134

TABLE 11
NUMBER OF CANDIDATES INTERVIEWED DURING RECRUITING VISITS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INTERVIEWS	75-90	100-450	123-900	1,698-2,116	412-3,780	726-14,833
AVERAGE	83	258	437	1,940	1,574	7,216

TABLE 12
CANDIDATES INVITED FOR SECOND INTERVIEWS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INVITATIONS	8-25	5-243	20-225	225-579	85-925	64-4,450
AVERAGE	17	73	107	353	389	1,707

TABLE 13
CANDIDATES ACCEPTING INVITATION FOR SECOND INTERVIEW

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
ACCEPTANCES	8-20	1-230	23-185	192-520	55-873	53-2,800
AVERAGE	14	51	91	322	331	1,357

TABLE 14
OFFERS OF EMPLOYMENT

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
OFFERS	5-13	0-140	12-111	128-315	32-760	14-1,768
AVERAGE	9	40	58	200	247	860

TABLE 15
HIRES RESULTING FROM CAMPUS RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
HIRES	3-10	0-75	12-61	42-106	19-440	6-696
AVERAGE	7	23	34	76	134	371

These tables provide figures which represent the experience of 39 firms of varying size during the 1981-82 recruiting year. Additionally, firms were asked to compare 1981-82 hiring with 1980-81. Fourteen firms reported increases (one to 300 percent: median increase was 40 percent) while the same number reported decreases (-12 to -75 percent); median decrease was -45 percent) and five firms reported no change. On the other hand, 1981-82 hires compared with the average for the previous five years found 17 firms reporting an increase (five to 1,000 percent: median was 52 percent), three reporting no change, and eight reporting a decrease (-3 to -85 percent: median was -47 percent). Hardest hit in terms of hiring declines were the largest firms.

In terms of campus interviewing, 23 firms reported recruiting at more campuses than previously, five recruited at the same number, and eight at fewer.

When asked to indicate the factors considered in determining whether a particular campus was included in campus interviewing, past hiring success and campus location (22 firms each), quality of program/students (17 firms), and college offers majors sought (14 firms), were most frequently cited. (See Table 16.)

TABLE 16
FACTORS DETERMINING WHETHER A PARTICULAR CAMPUS IS INCLUDED IN RECRUITING

Factor	Frequency
Proximity of college to major locations	22
Past success recruiting at college	22
Quality of program/graduates	17
College offers majors sought	14
Management mandate	5
Number of graduates	4
Success of prior graduates with company	3
Relationship with school/staff	2
Cost per hire	2
School offers intern program	1

An attempt was made to determine which terms of a job offer might be negotiable. Table 17 shows starting date and deadline for response to an offer are considered negotiable by most firms.

TABLE 17
NEGOTIABLE TERMS OF A JOB OFFER

Term	Frequency
Starting date	35
Deadline for response to offer	32
Location of employment	8
Starting salary	6

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate the greatest changes noted in college graduates over the past five years. Table 18 summarizes the varied responses.

TABLE 18
GREATEST CHANGES IN COLLEGE GRADUATES

Change	Frequency
Better prepared for job search	7
More career-oriented	7
More mature	5
Less mobile	3
More business-oriented	3
More knowledgeable about work/industry	2
Increase in number of unrealistic MBAs	2
Increased interest in fringe benefits	2
Technically more sound	2
More conservative	1
More committed to their field	1
More selective	1
More realistic in expectations	1
More specialized	1
More job market conscious in selection of majors	1
More interest in job challenge than money	1
More unrealistic career goals	1
Reduced company loyalty	1
Increase in number of dual career couples	1
Engineers not as well prepared	1
Graduates have become spoiled by heavy demand	1

RESEARCH AND CONSULTING ORGANIZATIONS

Twenty-eight research and consulting organizations participated in the study by returning completed forms. (See Table 1.)

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
NUMBER RESPONDING	15	5	3	3	1	1	28

RESPONSIBILITY FOR AND ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING

All but six of the participating firms indicated that there is a person at the corporate level responsible for all college relations/recruiting activities. (See Table 2.a.) The varied titles for that person are reported in Table 2.b. Years of tenure in the position range from one to 25 years with the average tenure being 5.1 years. Table 2.c reports the titles of the person to whom the college relations/recruiting coordinator reports.

TABLE 2.a
IS THERE A PERSON AT THE CORPORATE LEVEL RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL COLLEGE RELATIONS/ RECRUITING ACTIVITIES OF YOUR ORGANIZATION?

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	14	4	1	1	1	1	22
NO	1	1	2	2	0	0	6
TOTAL	15	5	3	3	1	1	28

TABLE 2.b
TITLE OF PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Vice President	1						1
Manager, Personnel	1						1
Manager, Employee Relations	2	1					3
Manager, Employment	1	1					2
Manager, Corporate Staffing	1						1
Manager, Staffing				1			1
Manager, College Recruiting					1		1
Executive Director, Personnel and Education						1	1
Director, Personnel	4						4
Director, Human Resources	1						1
Director, Professional Recruiting	1						1
Assistant Director, Personnel		1					1
Supervisor, Personnel Administration	1						1
Personnel Administrator		1					1
College Relations and Recruiting Representative	1						1
College Recruiter			1				1
TOTAL	14	4	1	1	1	1	22

TABLE 2.c
TITLE OF PERSON TO WHOM CORPORATE COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING COORDINATOR REPORTS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
President	1						1
Sr. V.P., Administration	1						1
Executive V.P.	1						1
V.P., Administration	3						3
V.P., Personnel	1						1
V.P., Employee Relations	1	1			1		3
V.P., Personnel and Public Relations						1	1
Director, Personnel	2	3		1			6
Director, Human Resources	3						3
Manager, Personnel	1						1
Manager, Employment			1				1
TOTAL	14	4	1	1	1	1	22

Respondents were further asked to indicate which of three organizational patterns best described their college relations and recruiting activities: Centralized (all handled at the corporate level); Combination (coordinated at the corporate level but work carried out at operating unit level); or, Decentralized (all handled at operating unit level). Table 2.d. shows that the centralized pattern is most frequently followed, most likely because over one-half of the organizations participating were small (less than 1,000 employees) and operate out of one or a limited number of locations.

TABLE 2.d
ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING FUNCTION

Size (Number of Employees)

ORGANIZATION	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Centralized	11	1	0	2	0	0	14
Combination	3	3	1	1	1	1	10
Decentralized	1	1	2	0	0	0	4
TOTAL	15	5	3	3	1	1	28

In terms of college relations and recruiting staffing, firms were asked to indicate both the number of persons who devote a majority of their time to the function and the number who devote a lesser amount of time (e.g., personnel who conduct campus interviews). Tables 2.e and 2.f show the responses. Most firms reported that the majority of part-time personnel were drawn from operating areas other than personnel.

TABLE 2.e
NUMBER OF PERSONS DEVOTING A MAJORITY OF TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

SIZE (Number of Employees)

NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	5	4		1			10
1	5	1	1	1			8
2	4						4
3			1				1
4	1				1		2
10			1				1
11				1			1
45						1	1
TOTAL	15	5	3	3	1	1	28

TABLE 2.f
NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL DEVOTING SOME TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	3						3
1	3			1			4
2	1						1
3	1						1
4	2						2
5	1	2					3
6	1		1				2
10	1	2	1				4
18		1					1
20			1				1
30				1			1
40	1						1
42					1		1
50	1						1
180				1			1
400						1	1
TOTAL	15	5	3	3	1	1	28

EVALUATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Twenty-one of the 28 participating firms indicated that there were criteria by which their college relations/recruiting program was evaluated. Many cited multiple criteria. Most frequently cited were number hired or meeting goals/quota (11), offer/hire ratio (nine), quality or performance of hires (seven), cost per hire (two), and interview/offer ratio (two).

ACTIVITIES UTILIZED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Seventeen different activities associated with college relations/recruiting were listed on the survey form and respondents were asked to indicate the activities their firm engaged in and those which were considered high priority. Table 3 reports the findings.

Cultivating key faculty/staff contacts was an activity employed by every firm (28) with nearly as many (25) providing printed recruiting material. Summer hiring of students (22), hiring students through co-op and intern programs (20), and participating in campus career days and providing speakers to faculty and student organizations (15 each) were also cited by a majority of participating firms.

TABLE 3
ACTIVITIES NORMALLY USED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Printed recruiting material	12 (5)	5	3 (1)	3 (1)	1 (1)	1	25 (8)
Audio/visual recruiting material	1			1			2
Cultivating key faculty/staff contacts	15 (3)	5 (1)	3 (1)	3 (1)	1	1	28 (6)
Cultivating key student contacts	6 (1)	1	2 (1)	1 (1)	1	1	12 (3)
Providing speakers to faculty or student organizations	7 (2)	2	2 (2)	2	1	1	15 (4)
Scholarships or grants awarded to an academic department or institution to support student aid (based on either academic performance or financial need)	3	1	1 (1)		1 (1)	1	7 (2)
Summer hiring of students	12 (1)	3	3 (1)	2	1	1	22 (2)
Summer hiring of faculty	2 (1)		1	2		1	6 (1)

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Participating in campus career days	6 (2)	3	2 (1)	2	1	1	15 (3)
Hiring students through co-op, intern or other similar programs sponsored by a campus	9 (1)	3	3 (1)	3	1	1	20 (2)
Conferences or seminars for placement personnel and faculty at your expense	2			1			3
Contributions of cash or equipment to selected campuses	4	1		1		1	7
Sponsorship of student or faculty projects, such as research	2		1	1		1	5
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students at professional conferences	1		2	1	1		5
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students while you are on campus	2	1		2			5

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Gifts of advertising materials, e.g., pens, lighters, desk accessories, etc.		1		1			2
Advertising through campus newspapers	7 (1)	4	2 (1)	3		1	17 (2)

*First number represents frequency of use while number in parentheses represents high priority activity as indicated by respondents.

Another way of assessing high priority activities was to ask firms what they considered to be the single most important thing they could do to assure productive recruiting year in and year out. Maintaining contact and communication with college campuses was cited by the most firms (12), while prompt candidate follow-up was mentioned by two firms.

Employers were also asked whether they offered hiring bonuses or other incentives to new college graduates or whether they utilized agencies or search firms to hire new graduates. Only one of the 28 firms indicated they offered incentives to new graduates (engineers only) and one indicated using agencies (operations, control and distribution if positions not filled through campus recruiting). The latter firm paid agency fees.

Similarly, employers were asked whether they had used external consultants to review college relations/recruiting operations or to train staff. Only two firms reported using external consultants. Concerning formal training programs for personnel engaged in campus recruiting, only six of the 28 firms had such a program. (See Table 4.)

TABLE 4
FORMAL INTERVIEWER TRAINING PROGRAMS*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
PROGRAM	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	0	1	1	2	1	1	6
NO	15	4	2	1	0	0	22
TOTAL	15	5	3	3	1	1	28

*Of those having a formal training program, the programs vary in length from four to 30 hours and average 11.6 hours in length.

COST PER NEW GRADUATE HIRED

The average cost (out-of-pocket expense excluding salaries of staff) per new graduate hired was reported by 16 firms and ranged from $100 to $18,000. The median cost per hire was $2,000.

FREQUENCY OF HIRING QUOTA REVIEW

Most firms reported conducting review of hiring quotas with annual review most frequently cited (14 firms), followed by quarterly (five), monthly (four), weekly (two), and semi-annually (one).

Several items relating to change in college relations/recruiting over time were included in the survey. Tables 5 through 8 report the results.

TABLE 5
GREATEST CHANGES NOTED OVER PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
Salary escalation/compression	3
Shortage of technical graduates	2
Increased competition for top students	2
Fluctuating demand for technical graduates	1
Increased number of technical graduates	1
Fewer advanced degree technical graduates	1
More graduates available	1
Better organized placement	1
Better targeting of productive colleges	1

(Continued)

Table 5 (Continued)

Change	Frequency
More difficult for smaller firms to compete with larger firms	1
Graduates more independent	1
Depressed job market	1
Graduates over-coached for interviewing	1
Graduates better informed about employers	1

TABLE 6
GREATEST CHANGES TO BE MADE OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
Coming to grips with supply/demand problem	3
Must become more cost-effective	2
Must deal with salary compression	1
More selectivity in colleges recruited	1
Improved selection methods	1
More use of technology in recruiting	1
More innovative recruiting techniques	1
More interviewing off-campus due to lack of pre-screening	1
Must become more professional	1
Keeping up with changes coming out of Washington, D.C.	1

TABLE 7
GREATEST PROBLEM (OTHER THAN ECONOMY) FACING EMPLOYERS OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Problem	Frequency
Salary compression	3
The declining number of U.S. students in technical disciplines	2
The declining number of U.S. faculty	1
Maintaining technical enrollments	1
Colleges staying up with state-of-the-art technology	1
Travel costs for recruiting	1
Matching student expectations to company needs	1
Decline in demand for graduates	1
Lack of jobs for non-technical graduates	1

TABLE 8
HAS YOUR ORGANIZATION HAD TO MAKE ANY DRASTIC CHANGES DUE TO THE CONDITION OF THE JOB MARKET OR DUE TO CHANGES IN RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATES?

Response*	Frequency
YES	10
NO	17

*Changes made	Frequency
Escalate salaries	6
More thorough screening	2
Offer hiring bonus	1
Relocate operations to more desirable area	1
Reduce campus visits	1

VOLUME OF RECRUITING ACTIVITY REPORTED

Table 9 reports the number of recent college graduates hires from all sources (campus and non-campus) made by participating firms during the 1981-82 recruiting year.

TABLE 9
RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATE HIRES DURING 1981-82 RECRUITING YEAR

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
RANGE	0-35	5-30	34-54	0-40	74	1,025
AVERAGE	8	14	44	26	74	1,025

Firms were additionally asked to indicate the percent of hires from both campus and non-campus sources. Due to inconsistencies in responses, the results could not be reported. However, by comparing Table 9 (total new graduate hires) and Table 15 (hires resulting from campus recruiting), it is apparent that the vast majority of new graduate hires resulted from campus recruiting.

Tables 10 through 15 report campus activity (number of campuses visited, number of campus interviews conducted, number of candidates invited for second interviews, acceptances of invitation for second interview, employment offers, and acceptances).

TABLE 10
NUMBER OF CAMPUSES VISITED FOR RECRUITING PURPOSES

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001- 2,500	2,501- 5,000	5,001- 10,000	10,001- 20,000	Over 20,000
CAMPUSES VISITED	0-55	6-30	30	10-93	65	*
AVERAGE	13	14	30	52	65	*

*Not specified

TABLE 11
NUMBER OF CANDIDATES INTERVIEWED DURING RECRUITING VISITS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001- 2,500	2,501- 5,000	5,001- 10,000	10,000 20,000	Over 20,000
INTERVIEWS	30-924	50-200	697-791	100-596	1,500	8,645
AVERAGE	326	106	744	348	1,500	8,645

TABLE 12
CANDIDATES INVITED FOR SECOND INTERVIEWS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001- 2,500	2,501- 5,000	5,001- 10,000	10,001- 20,000	Over 20,000
INVITATIONS	4-250	5-50	55-195	33-75	489	2,568
AVERAGE	70	25	125	54	489	2,568

TABLE 13
CANDIDATES ACCEPTING INVITATION FOR SECOND INTERVIEW

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001- 2,500	2,501- 5,000	5,001- 10,000	10,001- 20,000	Over 20,000
ACCEPTANCES	3-200	5-35	52-193	21-60	393	2,257
AVERAGE	60	20	123	41	393	2,257

TABLE 14
OFFERS OF EMPLOYMENT

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
OFFERS	1-50	4-15	48-111	4-50	167	1,578
AVERAGE	20	10	80	27	167	1,578

TABLE 15
HIRES RESULTING FROM CAMPUS RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
HIRES	1-35	2-14	30-34	0-40	74	1,025
AVERAGE	12	7	32	20	74	1,025

Firms were also asked to indicate how recruiting in 1981-82 compared with 1980-81 and with the average of the previous five years. Nine reported an increase over 1980-81 (10 to 90 percent with the median increase being 30 percent), two reported no change, and ten reported a decline (-7 to -100 percent with the median decrease being -35 percent). When comparing 1981-82 against the average of the previous five years, almost identical findings were noted. In terms of the number of campuses recruited compared to the average of the previous five years, six firms reported an increase, 11 a decrease, and nine reported no change.

When asked to indicate the factors considered in determining whether a particular campus was included in recruiting, the offering of majors sought (17 firms), past success recruiting at the college (12 firms), quality of program/graduates (11 firms), and location (eight firms) were most frequently cited. (See Table 16.)

TABLE 16
FACTORS DETERMINING WHETHER A PARTICULAR CAMPUS IS INCLUDED IN RECRUITING

Factor	Frequency
College offers majors sought	17
Past success recruiting at college	12
Quality of program/graduates	11
Proximity to major locations	8
Number of graduates	4
Number of women/minority candidates	1
Relationship with college	1
Management pressure	1
Students willing to relocate	1
Does the college offer state-of-the-art technical programs?	1

An attempt was made to determine the extent to which certain terms of a job offer were negotiable (Table 17). The deadline for response to a job offer and the starting date of employment were considered negotiable by all but one firm.

TABLE 17
NEGOTIABLE TERMS OF A JOB OFFER

Term	Frequency
Deadline for response to offer	27
Starting date	27
Starting salary	8
Location of employment	6

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate the greatest changes noted in college graduates over the past five years. Table 18 summarizes the varied responses.

TABLE 18
GREATEST CHANGES IN COLLEGE GRADUATES

Change	Frequency
More career-oriented	5
More specialized/technical	3
Increased number of technical graduates	2
Too much coaching for interviewing	1
More interest in job and company	1
Less career-directed	1
Less mature	1
Better trained technically	1
More favorable toward business	1
Women graduates more mobile	1
More knowledgeable about career choices	1
More conservative	1
More selective of employers	1
More concern with quality of life	1
More serious	1
More goal-oriented	1
More women in engineering	1
More graduating	1
Have become traumatized due to decline in number of jobs	1
Ask for more information from employers	1

UTILITIES--PUBLIC (INCLUDING TRANSPORTATION)

Sixty-one firms participated in this study by returning completed forms. All size categories are represented. (See Table 1.)

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE

SIZE (Number of Employees)

	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
NUMBER RESPONDING	3	10	10	17	5	16	61

RESPONSIBILITY FOR AND ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING

Fifty-seven of the 61 firms participating indicated that there was a person at the corporate level responsible for all college relations and recruiting activities. (See Table 2.a.) Titles varied for both that person (Table 2.b) and for the individual to whom he/she reports (Table 2.c). The years of tenure in the college relations recruiting position ranged from one month to 27 years with the average being 3.8 years.

TABLE 2.a
IS THERE A PERSON AT THE CORPORATE LEVEL
RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL COLLEGE RELATIONS/
RECRUITING ACTIVITIES OF YOUR ORGANIZATION?

SIZE (Number of Employees)

RESPONSE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	3	9	9	16	5	15	57
NO	0	1	1	1	0	1	4
TOTAL	3	10	10	17	5	16	61

TABLE 2.b
TITLE OF PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
V.P., Personnel		1			1		2
V.P., Industrial Relations				1			1
V.P., Employee Relations				1			1
Mgr., Personnel	1		1			2	4
Manager, Employment				1		4	5
Manager, College Relations			1				1
Manager, Recruitment and Employment					1		1
Manager, Assessment						1	1
Manager, Professional Recruiting						1	1
Manager, Employee and College Relations						1	1
Assistant Manager, Employment						2	2
Assistant Manager, Staffing				1			1
Director, Personnel		2					2
Director, Employment			1			1	2
Director, Personnel Relations				1			1
Director, College Relations					1		1
Supervisor, Employment and Planning				1			1
Supervisor, Employee Relations	1			1			2

(Continued)

Table 2.b (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Supervisor, Employment and Placement			1				1
Supervisor, Employment			1				1
Supervisor, Personnel				2			2
Supervisor, Recruiting				2			2
Supervisor, Professional Placement				1	1		2
Supervisor, College and Professional Recruiting						1	1
Coordinator, Employment				1			1
Coordinator, Recruiting			1				1
Coordinator, Staffing			1				1
Coordinator, Professional Employment			1				1
Coordinator, Management Employment			1				1
Coordinator, Technical Employment				1			1
Administrator, Employment and Selection		1					1
Administrator, Employment	1						1
Specialist, Human Resources		1					1
Employment Representative				2			2
Recruiting Officer					1		1

(Continued)

Table 2.b (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Division Staff Manager						1	1
College Relations Representative		1					1
Personnel Asst.		2					2
Junior Personnel Assistant		1					1
TOTAL	3	9	9	16	5	14	56

TABLE 2.c
TITLE OF PERSON TO WHOM CORPORATE COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING COORDINATOR REPORTS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Chief Executive Officer				1			1
President		1					1
Executive V.P.				1	1		2
Sr. V.P., Administration			1				1
Vice President	1	1					2
V.P., Human Resources		1					1
V.P., Employee Relations				1			1
V.P., Development and Placement					1		1
V.P., Personnel					1		1
Assistant V.P., Personnel						4	4
Assistant V.P., Human Resources						1	1
Assistant V.P., Management Administration						1	1

(Continued)

Table 2.c (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Assistant V.P.						1	1
Manager, Employment		2		4		1	7
Manager, Personnel			3				3
Manager, Employee Relations		2	1				3
Manager, Staffing and EEO			1				1
Division Manager, Employment and Personnel Administration						2	2
Director, Personnel	1	1		3	1		6
Director, Employee Development			1	1			2
Director, Staffing and Development			1				1
Director, Manpower Planning				2		1	3
Director Human Resources				1			1
Director, Employment				1			1
Director, Management Development						1	1
Director, Affirmative Action and Training						1	1
Supervisor, Personnel	1						1
Supervisor, Employment				1			1
Supervisor, Professional Employment						1	1

(Continued)

Table 2.c (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Administrator, Human Resources		1					1
Administrator, Recruiting and Placement					1		1
Chief of Personnel						1	1
TOTAL	3	9	8	16	5	15	56

Respondents were further asked to indicate which of three organizational patterns best described their college relations and recruiting activities: Centralized (all handled at the corporate level); Combination (coordinated at the corporate level but work carried out at operating unit level); or, Decentralized (all handled at operating unit level). Table 2.d shows that among responding firms the centralized approach is followed by a majority of firms (47).

TABLE 2.d
ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING FUNCTION

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
ORGANIZATION	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Centralized	2	9	7	15	2	12	47
Combination	1	1	2	1	3	4	12
Decentralized	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
TOTAL	3	10	10	17	5	16	61

In terms of staffing for college relations and recruiting, firms were asked to indicate both the number of persons who devote a majority of their time to the function and the number who devote a lesser amount of time (e.g., personnel who conduct campus interviews). Tables 2.e and 2.f show the responses. Individuals who are engaged in college relations/recruiting on a part-time basis are drawn about equally from personnel and non-personnel areas.

TABLE 2.e
NUMBER OF PERSONS DEVOTING A MAJORITY OF TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	2	4	1	1	1	2	11
1	1	6	4	8	1	3	23
2			2	4	1	2	9
3			3	2		2	7
5				2	2	1	5
8						3	3
14						1	1
29						1	1
35						1	1
TOTAL	3	10	10	17	5	16	61

TABLE 2.f
NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL DEVOTING SOME TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0			3	1	1		5
1		2	1	1		1	5
2			2			1	3
3				3			3
4						5	5
5	1	2					3
6			1				1
7		1					1
8				2		1	3
9				1			1
10		1		3		1	5
12				1			1
13	1			1		2	4
14			1				1
15					1		1
20		1	1	1		1	4
23				1			1
25					1	1	2
27		1					1

(Continued)

Table 2.f (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
34				1			1
50					1	3	4
65					1		1
TOTAL	2	8	9	16	5	16	56

EVALUATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Forty-eight of the firms responding to the question "Are there criteria by which the performance of your college relations/recruiting program is evaluated?" indicated there were such criteria. Many firms listed multiple criteria. Most frequently cited were meeting hiring goals or quotas (21 firms), offer/acceptance ratio (16 firms), quality of new hires (15 firms), and cost per hire (10 firms).

ACTIVITIES UTILIZED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Seventeen different activities associated with college relations/recruiting were listed on the survey form and respondents were asked to indicate those activities their firm engaged in and those which were considered high priority. Table 3 reports the findings.

TABLE 3
ACTIVITIES NORMALLY USED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Printed recruiting material	3	10 (5)	8 (4)	16 (6)	5 (2)	16 (4)	58 (21)
Audio/visual recruiting material	1	4 (1)	3	6	1	8 (1)	23 (2)

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Cultivating key faculty/staff contacts	3 (2)	9	6 (2)	13 (3)	5 (2)	15 (3)	51 (12)
Cultivating key student contacts	1	4	4 (1)	10 (1)	2 (1)	10 (3)	31 (6)
Providing speakers to faculty or student organizations	1	6	6	13	4	13 (3)	43 (3)
Scholarships or grants awarded to an academic department or institution to support student aid (based on either academic performance or financial need)	1	1	6 (3)	8	2	4	22 (3)
Summer hiring of students	2 (1)	6 (1)	7 (1)	16 (4)	3 (1)	11 (1)	45 (9)
Summer hiring of faculty		1	2 (1)	5	1	4	13 (1)
Participating in campus career days	2	7 (1)	7 (2)	15 (2)	4	13 (3)	48 (8)
Hiring students through co-op, intern or other similar programs sponsored by a campus	3 (1)	7 (1)	4	11 (2)	4	11 (2)	40 (6)
Conferences or seminars for placement personnel and faculty at your expense	1 (1)		1	3	1	4	10 (1)

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Contributions of cash or equipment to selected campuses	2	2	2	8	2	5 (1)	21 (1)
Sponsorship of student or faculty projects, such as research		1	2	6 (1)	1	2	12 (1)
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students at professional conferences	1		1	1		7	10
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students while you are on campus		4 (1)	4	8	2	7	25 (1)
Gifts of advertising materials, e.g., pens, lighters, desk accessories, etc.				1		4 (1)	5 (1)
Advertising through campus newspapers	2	4 (1)	4	4 (1)	2	4	20 (2)

*First number represents frequency of use while number in parentheses represents high priority activity as indicated by respondents.

Another way of assessing high priority activities was to ask firms to indicate what they considered the single most important thing they could do to assure productive recruiting year in and year out. The importance of maintaining good relationships and communication with campuses was cited by 29 of the participating firms while another 10 firms listed such related things as providing more co-op and intern opportunities for students, maintaining a staff of professionally trained recruiters, and maintaining quality and consistency of effort with colleges.

Firms were asked whether they offered hiring bonuses or other incentives to new college graduate hires or whether they utilized agencies or search firms to hire new graduates. Only one of the 61 participating firms reported using hiring bonuses (for engineers only) and only three reported the use of agencies or search firms (for engineers, programmers and finance). Two firms indicated that they would pay related fees.

The firms were also asked whether they had ever utilized external consultants to review their college relations/recruiting operations or to train staff. Eleven firms had used consultants. Twenty-nine of the firms reported that they had a formal training program for personnel who would be engaged in campus interviewing. (See Table 4.)

TABLE 4
FORMAL INTERVIEWER TRAINING PROGRAMS*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
PROGRAM	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	2	3	4	5	3	12	29
NO	1	7	6	11	2	4	31
TOTAL	3	10	10	16	5	16	60

*The length of formal interviewer training was reported from one to 200 hours with an average length of 29.5 hours.

COST PER NEW GRADUATE HIRED

The average cost (out-of-pocket expense excluding salaries of staff) per new graduate hired was reported by 29 firms and ranged from $57 to $4,125. The median cost was $1,000. Many firms did not report cost figures or did not have them available in the form requested.

FREQUENCY OF HIRING QUOTA REVIEW

Fifty-five firms reported that review of hiring quotas was conducted periodically. Annual review was most frequently listed (27 firms) followed by semi-annual (10), quarterly (nine), monthly (seven), as needed (one), and constantly (one).

Several items relating to change in the college relations/recruiting function over time were included in the survey. Tables 5 through 8 report results.

TABLE 5
GREATEST CHANGES NOTED OVER PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
Increased competition for technical graduates	16
Better quality/more helpful placement services	6
Better relationships between employers and placement offices	5
Rapidly escalating salaries (especially for technical graduates)	4
Reduction in number of entry-level jobs	3
Recruiters have become more professional	2
Increasing variety of methods for interview sign-up	2
More emphasis on fall recruiting	2
Increased awareness of recruiting costs	2
More demand from colleges for research support	1
More candidates available	1
More experienced candidates available	1
Graduates more professional in behavior	1
Graduates more knowledgeable career-wise	1
Recruiting methods/strategies improved	1
More use of pre-screening	1
More emphasis on hiring long-term employees	1
Placement offices more aggressive	1

TABLE 6
GREATEST CHANGES TO BE MADE OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
Must develop better screening and selection methods	5
More extensive pre-recruiting/pre-screening	5
Increasing demand for technical graduates	4
Closer relationships between colleges and employers	4
More cost consciousness on part of employers	3
Employers will become more aggressive	3
More co-op and summer opportunities will be made available to students	3

(Continued)

Table 6 (Continued)

Change	Frequency
Adjusting to decline in number of jobs to fill	2
Better manpower planning	2
Employers will have to market themselves and their geographic areas better	2
Fewer jobs will be available	1
More alumni will be interviewing through on-campus recruiting	1
Industry will have to help colleges more	1
Placement offices will have to become more consistent in use of forms, procedures, etc.	1
Further escalation of salaries	1
More sensitivity to all candidates	1

TABLE 7
GREATEST PROBLEM (OTHER THAN ECONOMY) FACING EMPLOYERS OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
Shortage of technical graduates	19
Shortage of faculty in technical areas	4
Matching the role of colleges to society's need for manpower	3
Starting salaries too high/salary compression	3
Finding academically qualified graduates	2
Making campus recruiting more cost effective	2
Meeting AA/EEO goals	2
Maintaining budget support	2
Identifying the best graduates	2
Decline in number of entry-level jobs	2
Glut of business graduates, especially MBAs	1
Glut of engineers in three-four years	1
Dealing with dual career couples	1
Poor manpower planning	1
Maintaining recruiting efforts in down market	1
Lack of appropriate response by students to companies offering them jobs	1

TABLE 8
HAS YOUR ORGANIZATION HAD TO MAKE ANY DRASTIC CHANGES DUE TO THE CONDITIONS OF THE JOB MARKET OR DUE TO CHANGES IN RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATES?

Response*	Frequency
YES	25
NO	32

*Changes Made	Frequency
Escalated salaries	11
More thorough screening	8
Recruit more colleges	1
Reduce recruiting	3
Relocation benefits	2
Increase promotion opportunities	1

VOLUME OF RECRUITING ACTIVITY REPORTED

Table 9 represents the number of recent college graduate hires by participating firms during the 1981-82 recruiting year. These figures represent hires from all sources (campus and non-campus).

TABLE 9
RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATE HIRES DURING 1981-82 RECRUITING YEAR

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
RANGE	1-6	2-29	0-118	6-125	33-382	0-260
AVERAGE	3	14	28	46	188	68

Firms were additionally asked to indicate the percent of hires from both campus and non-campus sources, however, figures were inconsistently reported and results could not be presented. A comparison of Table 9 (hires from all sources) and Table 15 (hires resulting from campus recruiting) shows that the vast majority of new graduates hired during 1981-82 were through campus recruiting.

Tables 10 through 15 report campus recruiting activity (number of campuses visited, number of campus interviews conducted, number of candidates invited for second interviews, acceptances of invitation for second interview, employment offers, and acceptances).

TABLE 10
NUMBER OF CAMPUSES VISITED FOR RECRUITING PURPOSES

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
CAMPUSES VISITED	1-11	0-30	0-23	13-46	11-101	8-81
AVERAGE	5	13	12	24	55	35

TABLE 11
NUMBER OF CANDIDATES INTERVIEWED DURING RECRUITING VISITS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INTERVIEWS	38-97	75-450	50-570	110-845	342-2,127	59-3,500
AVERAGE	68	230	244	376	1,185	988

TABLE 12
CANDIDATES INVITED FOR SECOND INTERVIEWS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
INVITATIONS	9-29	4-100	4-200	9-300	62-1,105	3-1,200
AVERAGE	19	48	82	127	496	208

TABLE 13
CANDIDATES ACCEPTING INVITATION FOR SECOND INTERVIEW

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
ACCEPTANCES	5-26	4-80	4-180	9-275	47-849	3-800
AVERAGE	16	41	73	109	392	139

TABLE 14
OFFERS OF EMPLOYMENT

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
OFFERS	1-10	2-57	0-110	5-240	26-674	3-400
AVERAGE	5	27	46	70	302	84

TABLE 15
HIRES RESULTING FROM CAMPUS RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)					
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000
HIRES	0-5	2-29	0-85	3-125	3-291	2-200
AVERAGE	2	14	28	36	133	49

These tables represent the experiences of firms in the public utilities field in college recruiting during the 1981-82 recruiting year. The impact of the economy has certainly been felt by a number of firms as 20 indicated that hiring of new graduates had declined from 1980-81 to 1981-82 (from -3 to -90 percent: median decline was -38 percent) while six firms reported no change and 21 an increase (one to 400 percent: median increase was 22 percent). Hiring during 1981-82 compared to the average of the previous five years found 16 firms with a decline (-9 to -100 percent: median decline was -30 percent), four reported no change, and 21 reported an increase (five to 235 percent: median increase was 50 percent).

Similarly, firms were asked how the number of campuses recruited during 1981-82 compared to previous years. Twenty reported an increase, 18 reported no change, and 21 reported a decrease.

When asked to indicate the factors considered in determining whether a particular campus was included in campus recruiting, four primary factors emerged: the presence of majors sought, location, past recruiting success, and the quality of program/graduates. Table 16 presents the complete findings.

TABLE 16
FACTORS DETERMINING WHETHER A PARTICULAR CAMPUS IS INCLUDED IN RECRUITING

Factor	Frequency
College offers majors sought	34
Proximity of college to major locations	32
Past success recruiting at college	25
Quality of program/graduates	14
Success of previous hires	5
Number of women/minority graduates	5
Previous relationship with college	5
Cost per hire	3
Number of graduates	2

An attempt was made to determine the extent to which certain terms of a job offer might be negotiable. Table 17 shows the number of firms considering each term negotiable. It appears that starting date and deadline for response to an offer are almost universally regarded as negotiable.

TABLE 17
NEGOTIABLE TERMS OF A JOB OFFER

Term	Frequency
Starting date	58
Deadline for response to offer	53
Starting salary	12
Location of employment	11

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate the greatest changes noted in college graduates over the past five years. Table 18 summarizes the results.

TABLE 18
GREATEST CHANGES IN COLLEGE GRADUATES

Change	Frequency
Better prepared for job search	6
More salary conscious (demanding)	6
More career-oriented	5
Better prepared academically	5
More mature	3
More concerned with what company can do for them	3
More specialized	3
Increased concern for quality of life issues	2
Expectations are too high	2
More pro-business	2
More competitive	2
More independent	2
Decline in academic excellence	2
Too much emphasis on the MBA	1
More mobile	1
Less experienced	1
Want to move (be promoted) too fast	1
Too many technical graduates in field for wrong reasons	1
More dual career couples	1
More serious	1
Have clearer goals	1
More realistic	1
Shift from emphasis on salary to career opportunities	1
Stronger work ethic	1
Better communication skills	1
More sophisticated	1
More interest in job content	1

GOVERNMENT (ALL LEVELS) AND NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

Twenty-six organizations in this rather diverse employer category participated in the study by returning completed survey forms. Table 1 shows the distribution of organizations by size.

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
NUMBER RESPONDING	8	1	6	6	1	9	31

RESPONSIBILITY FOR AND ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING

Twenty of the participating organizations reported that there was someone at the central staff level responsible for all college relations/recruiting activities. (See Table 2.a.)

TABLE 2.a
IS THERE A PERSON AT THE CORPORATE LEVEL
RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL COLLEGE RELATIONS/
RECRUITING ACTIVITIES OF YOUR ORGANIZATION?

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
RESPONSE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	6	1	4	5	1	3	20
NO	2	0	2	0	0	6	10
TOTAL	8	1	6	5	1	9	30

TABLE 2.b
TITLE OF PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Corporate Personnel Manager				1			1
Manager, Administrative Services	1						1
Mgr., Employment Programs				1			1
Director, Placement				1			1
Director, Personnel	1			1			2
Director, Recruiting and Placement		1					1
Director, Employment Services			2				2
Asst. Director, Personnel	1						1
Supervisor, Employment	1						1
National Recruiting Coordinator			1				1
Coord., State Recruiting						1	1
Head, Staff Recruiting						1	1
Chief Staff Recruiting				1			1
College Relations Officer			1				1
Personnel Analyst					1		1
Personnel Officer	1						1
Commander, Navy Recruiting Command						1	1
TOTAL	5	1	4	5	1	3	19

TABLE 2.c
TITLE OF PERSON TO WHOM CORPORATE COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING COORDINATOR REPORTS

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
TITLE	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Chief, Naval Operations						1	1
Director, Bureau of the Budget						1	1
Director, Department of Revenue	1						1
Director, Personnel			1	1			2
Director	1						1
Vice President		1					1
V.P., Planning and Development	1						1
V.P., Human Resources			1				1
V.P., Personnel			1				1
Controller				1			1
Group Manager, Operations				1			1
Section Chief					1		1
Director, Central Field Div.						1	1
Assoc. Director Human Resources			1				1
Asst. Director, Administration	1						1
TOTAL	4	1	4	3	1	3	16

Respondents were asked to indicate which of three organizational patterns best described their college relations and recruiting program: Centralized (all handled at the corporate level); Combination (coordinated at corporate level but work carried out at operating unit level); or, Decentralized (all handled at operating unit level). Table 2.d shows the mixture of organizational patterns identified.

TABLE 2.d
ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING FUNCTION

SIZE (Number of Employees)

ORGANIZATION	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Centralized	6	1	3	3	0	2	15
Combination	0	0	2	3	1	6	12
Decentralized	2	0	1	0	0	1	4
TOTAL	8	1	6	6	1	9	31

In terms of staffing for college relations and recruiting, organizations were asked to indicate both the number of persons who devote a majority of their time to the function and the number who devote a lesser amount of time (e.g., personnel who conduct campus interviews). Tables 2.e and 2.f report the findings.

TABLE 2.e
NUMBER OF PERSONS DEVOTING A MAJORITY OF TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

SIZE (Number of Employees)

NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	5		2	3		2	12
1	3		2			1	6
2		1	2		1		4
3				1		1	2
5						1	1
9						1	1
12						1	1
15						1	1
17				1			1
250						1	1
TOTAL	8	1	6	5	1	9	30

TABLE 2.f
NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL DEVOTING SOME
TIME TO COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
NUMBER	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
0	3	1	1				5
1	1						1
2	1			2		2	5
3			2				2
4			1	1			2
5	2				1		3
6						2	2
9						1	1
15	1						1
18				1			1
30			1			1	2
35				1			1
40			1				1
85						1	1
6,000						1	1
TOTAL	8	1	6	5	1	8	29

EVALUATION OF COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Employers were asked "Are there criteria by which the performance of your college relations/recruiting program is evaluated?" Government and non-profit organizations were almost equally split with 14 reporting evaluation criteria and 13 indicating there were none. Most frequently cited criteria were number hired or meeting goals/quotas (11), retention of hires (four), and cost per hire (three).

ACTIVITIES UTILIZED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING

Seventeen different activities associated with college relations/recruiting were listed on the survey form and respondents were asked to indicate the activities their firm engaged in and those which were considered high priority. Table 3 reports the findings.

Providing printed recruiting material (25 organizations), cultivating key faculty/staff contacts and participating in campus career days (22 each), summer hiring of students (19), and hiring students through co-op and intern programs and providing speakers to faculty or student organizations (18 each) were the most popular activities.

TABLE 3
ACTIVITIES NORMALLY USED IN COLLEGE RELATIONS/RECRUITING*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,00	TOTAL
Printed recruiting material	5 (1)		5	5 (1)	1 (1)	9 (2)	25 (5)
Audio/visual recruiting material			3			4	7
Cultivating key faculty/staff contacts	7	1	3 (1)	4	1	6	22 (1)
Cultivating key student contacts	4		2	1		3	10
Providing speakers to faculty or student organizations	4		5	3	1	5	18
Scholarships or grants awarded to an academic department or institution to support student aid (based on either academic performance or financial need)							0
Summer hiring of students	5 (3)		4	3	1	6	19 (3)
Summer hiring of faculty	2 (1)		1			1	4 (1)
Participating in campus career days	3		4	5	1	9 (1)	22 (1)

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Hiring students through co-op, intern or other similar programs sponsored by a campus	2		4	5 (1)	1 (1)	6 (1)	18 (3)
Conferences or seminars for placement personnel and faculty at your expense	1					1	2
Contributions of cash or equipment to selected campuses				1			1
Sponsorship of student or faculty projects, such as research	1		1				2
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students at professional conferences				1		1	2
Hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students while you are on campus			1			1	2
Gifts of advertising materials, e.g., pens, lighters, desk accessories, etc.							0

(Continued)

Table 3 (Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Advertising through campus newspapers	2		3	2		4	11

*First number represents frequency of use while number in parentheses represents high priority activity as indicated by respondents.

Another way of assessing high priority activities was to ask firms to indicate what they considered the single most important thing they could do to assure productive recruiting year in and year out. Seventeen organizations identified maintaining good communication and contacts with campuses as most important. No other activity was mentioned by more than two organizations.

Employers were next asked whether they used bonuses or other incentives to attract new college graduates, or whether they utilized agencies or search firms to hire new graduates. Four organizations (all over 20,000 employees) indicated that incentives were used for specialized majors (accounting, nursing, engineering, chemistry and mathematics). No organizations reported the use of agencies or search firms.

Next, employers were asked whether they had ever used external consultants to review their college relations/recruiting operations or to train staff. Only two organizations indicated that they had used consulting services. On the other hand, only five organizations reported that they had developed their own training program for staff who would be engaged in campus interviewing (Table 4), while 24 organizations did not provide for interviewer training.

TABLE 4
FORMAL INTERVIEWER TRAINING PROGRAMS*

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
PROGRAM	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
YES	0	0	2	0	0	3	5
NO	8	1	0	5	1	6	21
TOTAL	8	1	2	5	1	9	26

*Length of training programs reported as varying from three hours to four weeks.

COST PER NEW GRADUATE HIRED

Fourteen organizations reported average cost figures (out-of-pocket expense excluding salaries of staff) for each new graduate hired. Costs per graduate hired ranged from $150 to $3,350 and the median cost was $600.

FREQUENCY OF HIRING QUOTA REVIEW

Twenty-two of the participating organizations reported periodic review of hiring quotas and two reported they did not operate with quotas. Annual review was most frequently cited (10 organizations) while quarterly and semi-annual reviews were each conducted by four organizations, and two reported reviews as needed.

Several items relating to change in the college relations function over time were included in the survey. Tables 5 through 8 report results.

TABLE 5
GREATEST CHANGES NOTED OVER PAST FIVE YEARS

Change	Frequency
Increased demand for technical graduates	5
More help/direction for students from placement offices	3
Oversupply of graduates	1
Graduates offer more experience and higher quality	1
Escalation of salaries	1
Sophistication of recruiting efforts	1
Students more realistic about job market	1
Students more business-like	1
Greater use of co-op and summer jobs as recruitment tools	1
More associate-degree graduates being hired where bachelor's degree previously hired	1
More AA/EEO recruiting efforts	1
Overall, less emphasis on recruiting	1

TABLE 6
GREATEST CHANGES TO BE MADE OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Change	Frequency
Increased needs for and competition for technical graduates	6
Closer working relationship between colleges and employers to bring supply-demand problem under control	4
Recruiting must become more cost-efficient	3
Identifying new technologies where future needs will exist	3
More effective screening and assessment	3
New, more sophisticated recruiting methods	2
Recruiting will become more selective	2
Increased competition for entry jobs from experienced, unemployed graduates	1
Increased emphasis on retention	1
Greater use of telecommunications in recruiting	1
More post-employment training of new graduates	1
Fewer graduates available	1
More selective recruiting	1

TABLE 7
GREATEST PROBLEM (OTHER THAN ECONOMY) FACING EMPLOYERS OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

Problem	Frequency
Increased demand and competition for technical graduates	4
Declining student population	2
Legislative and legal implications of uniform guidelines and EEO	2
Lack of mobility in graduates	2
Lack of good manpower forecasting	1
Shortages of minority graduates	1
Government's difficulty in competing with private industry	1
Number of graduates with unrealistic goals and unmarketable majors	1
Budget reductions	1
Effectively utilizing new graduates	1
Shortage of U.S. graduates in technical disciplines	1
Escalating salaries	1
Lack of support for higher education	1
Utilizing the degreed and experienced unemployed	1

TABLE 8
HAS YOUR ORGANIZATION HAD TO MAKE ANY DRASTIC CHANGES DUE TO THE CONDITION OF THE JOB MARKET OR DUE TO CHANGES IN RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATES?

Response*	Frequency
YES	12
NO	17

*Changes Made	Frequency
Escalate salaries	2
Hiring bonus	1
Bonus to employee who refers a candidate	1
More thorough screening	3
Decrease hiring	2

VOLUME OF RECRUITING REPORTED

Included in the survey were several questions dealing with the volume of campus recruiting activity by participating employers. Specific questions were asked concerning the 1981-82 recruiting year and the number of campuses recruited, interviews conducted, invitations and acceptances for second interviews, offers of employment and acceptances. Also, data were sought with which comparisons could be made of the percentage of new college graduate hires coming from campus and non-campus sources, the number of hires in 1981-82 compared with 1980-81 and with the average of the previous five years, and finally, a comparison of the number of campuses recruited during 1981-82 with the average of the previous five years.

Few government and non-profit employers provided complete information and the data are insufficient for meaningful reporting with the exception of general comparisons of hiring and campus recruiting with previous years.

Sixteen of the participating organizations compared 1981-82 hiring with 1980-81 and with the average of the previous five years. Only four organizations reported increased hiring over the 1980-81 recruiting year (ranging from 25 to 300 percent increases), while three reported no change and nine reported decreased hiring (ranging from -15 to -50 percent with the median decline being -20 percent). The comparison of 1981-82 with the average of the previous five years yielded identical results. A comparison of the number of campuses recruited in 1981-82 with the average of the previous five years found only three organizations reporting an increase, eight reported no change, and 15 reported a reduction.

Employers were asked to indicate the factors considered in determining whether a particular campus was included in recruiting. Most frequently cited factors were whether the campus offered the majors sought (16), past recruiting success (15), and campus location (11). Table 9 reports the complete findings.

TABLE 9
FACTORS DETERMINING WHETHER A PARTICULAR CAMPUS IS INCLUDED IN RECRUITING

Factor	Frequency
Campus offers majors sought	16
Past success recruiting at campus	15
Proximity of college to major locations	11
Minority student representation	6
Quality of program/students	3
Number of graduates	2
Relationship with college	2
Cost of recruiting	2
Potential for summer hires	1

An attempt was made to determine the extent to which participating employers considered certain terms of a job offer to be negotiable. Table 10 presents the findings.

TABLE 10
NEGOTIABLE TERMS OF A JOB OFFER

Term	Frequency
Starting date	25
Deadline for response to offer	19
Location of employment	6
Starting salary	4

Finally, employers were asked to indicate the greatest changes noted in college graduates over the past five years. Responses are reported in Table 11.

TABLE 11
GREATEST CHANGES IN COLLEGE GRADUATES

Change	Frequency
More concern with non-job factors (benefits, quality of life) than job	6
Decline in verbal and written communication skills and quantitative skills	5
More realistic about entering job market	2
More goal-oriented	2
More conservative	2
More demanding of employers	2
Generally higher quality/better prepared	2
More competitive	1
More motivated	1
More materialistic	1
General decline in quality	1
More security conscious	1
Better technical skills	1
More with some business course background	1
Less career-oriented	1
Less loyalty to employer	1
More home computer background	1
More have some prior work experience	1

APPENDIX A

College Relations and Recruiting Survey
210 Swen Parson Hall
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL. 60115
Gary J. Scott, D.Ed.
Project Director

CPC®
THE CPC FOUNDATION

TO: College Relations/Recruiting Managers.

The CPC Foundation has commissioned me to undertake a study of college relations and recruiting activities in the United States. Your organization is one of 2,000 selected for inclusion in the study.

Since this is the first major study of its kind, your cooperation is especially important. Please complete the enclosed survey form as accurately and completely as possible and return it in the envelope provided by not later than September 11. It is hoped that the results of the study will provide both an accurate description of the present state of college relations and recruiting, and will serve as a guide for standards and future development in the field.

Please be assured that neither you nor your organization will be identified by name in reports or publications resulting from the study. Only summary data will be used in the final report and confidentiality of an individual organization's responses will be maintained.

A second survey will be mailed to the Chief Executive Officers of one out of every four organizations selected for the study. That survey will be much shorter and include items related to the CEO's expectations of and support for the college relations and recruiting function. If you are aware that your CEO has received this survey, please encourage him/her to complete and return the form.

The final report of this study will be made available to CPC employer members by the CPC Foundation.

Thank you for your cooperation and please return your survey by the September 11 deadline.

Sincerely,

Gary J. Scott

Gary J. Scott, D.Ed.
Project Director

THE CPC FOUNDATION
SURVEY OF COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING ACTIVITIES

Please note: **All responses will remain confidential** and will be used only in aggregate form. The organizational data requested is important to the study so that proper classification by industry and size can be made. A complete report of findings will be made available through the CPC Foundation.

Organization Name: ____________________

Title of Person Responding: ____________________

Geographic Region (check that region where corporate offices of primary operations are located).

- ☐ Eastern
- ☐ Mid-Atlantic
- ☐ Southern
- ☐ Midwest
- ☐ Rocky Mountain
- ☐ Southwest
- ☐ Western

Please indicate the total number of employees in your organization:

- ☐ under 1000
- ☐ 1,001-2,500
- ☐ 2,501-5,000
- ☐ 5,001-10,000
- ☐ 10,001-15,000
- ☐ 15,001-20,000
- ☐ over 20,001 (please specify) ____________________

Industry (check the one with which your organization is primarily known or associated).

- ☐ Accounting-Public
- ☐ Banking, Finance, Insurance
- ☐ Merchandising (Retail & Wholesale) & Services
- ☐ Aerospace, Electronics, & Instruments
- ☐ Automotive & Mechanical Equipment
- ☐ Building Materials Mfrs. & Construction
- ☐ Chemicals, Drugs & Allied Products
- ☐ Electrical Machinery & Equipment
- ☐ Food & Beverage Processing
- ☐ Glass, Paper, Packaging, & Allied Products
- ☐ Metals & Metal Products
- ☐ Petroleum & Allied Products (Inc. Nat. Gas)
- ☐ Research &/or Consulting Orgs.
- ☐ Tire & Rubber
- ☐ Utilities-Public (Inc. Transportation)
- ☐ Government-Federal
- ☐ Government-Local/State
- ☐ Non-Profit Orgs. & Educational Institutions

1. Is there a person at the corporate level responsible for all college relations/recruiting activities of your organization?

   ☐ Yes ☐ No

   If yes, what is that person's title? ____________________

   How long has that person been in the position? __________ Years

   To whom does that person report? ____________________

   ____

2. How is your college relations/recruiting function organized?

   - ☐ Centralized - all handled at corporate level
   - ☐ Combination - coordinated at corporate level but work carried out at operating unit level
   - ☐ Decentralized - all handled at operating unit level
   - ☐ Other (please specify) ____________________

   ____

   ____

3. How many individuals in you organization devote a majority of their time to the college relations/recruiting function? ____________________

   ____

   How many additional individuals in your organization devote some time to college relations/recruiting (e.g., personnel who conduct interviews on campuses)? ____________________

What percent of these people are primarily:
Personnel ________
Other areas ________

What is the approximate **full-time equivalent** (person days) of all staff who are engaged in college relations/recruiting? ________

4. At what management levels are each of the following decisions made?
To recruit at a particular campus ________
The number and mix of majors sought ________
To invite a candidate for a second interview ________
To hire a given individual ________
The College Relations/Recruiting budget ________
Starting salaries ________
Methods to be utilized in advertising/promotion ________

5. Please check each of the following which are normally part of your organization's college relations/recruting program. If the activity is considered to be of high priority please use a double check.
☐ printed recruiting material
☐ audio/visual recruting material
☐ cultivating key faculty/staff contacts
☐ cultivatng key student contacts
☐ providing speakers to faculty or student organizations
☐ scholarships or grants awarded to an academic department or institution to support student aid (based on either academic performance or financial need)
☐ summer hiring of students
☐ summer hiring of faculty
☐ participating in campus career days
☐ hiring students through co-op, intern or by other similar programs sponsored by a campus
☐ conferences or seminars for placement personnel and faculty at your expense
☐ contributions of cash or equipment to selected campuses
☐ sponsorsip of student or faculty projects, such as research
☐ hospitality hours for faculty, placement personnel, or students at professional conferences
☐ hospitality hours or meals for faculty, placement personnel, or students while you are on campus
☐ gifts of advertising materials, e.g., pens, lighters, desk accessories, etc.
☐ advertising through campus newspapers
☐ other (please specify) ________
____

6. Does your organization have a formal training program for personnel who will be engaged in campus interviewing?
☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, how long does the program last? ________ hours

7. Have you ever utilized external consultants to review your college relations/recruiting operations or to train staff?
☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, who have you utilized? ________
____

8. What is the average cost to your organization per recent college graduate hire (out-of-pocket expense directly related to college recruiting such as recruiter and candidate travel, literature, advertising, etc., and excluding personnel salaries)? $________ per hire.

9. Normally, how frequently are hiring quotas for new college graduates reviewed?
☐ weekly
☐ monthly
☐ quarterly
☐ annually
☐ other
(please specify) ________

10. Under normal circumstances, are any of the following terms of a job offer negotiable?
    - ☐ deadline for response to offer
    - ☐ starting salary
    - ☐ location of employment
    - ☐ starting date
    - ☐ other (please specify) ______

11. Are there criteria by which the performance of your college relations/recruiting program is evaluated?

    ☐ Yes ☐ No

    If yes, please specify ______

12. How many recent college graduates did your organization hire from all sources during the 1981-82 recruiting year? ______

    What percent change does this represent from the previous year? + or − ______%

    What percent change does this represent from the average of the last five years? + or − ______%

13. How many college campuses did representatives of your organization visit for recruiting purposes during the 1981-1982 recruiting year? ______

    How many candidates were interviewed during those visits? ______

    How many candidates were invited for a second interview? ______

    How many candidates accepted the invitation for a second interview? ______

    How many of these candidates were offered? ______

    How many of those offered accepted? ______

14. What percent of your 1981-82 new college graduate hires were attributable to each of the following:

Campus Sources	**Non-Campus Sources**
______% open sign-up	______% walk-in or write-in
______% pre-recruited students	______% referral from employee
______% referral from faculty or placement personnel	______% agency, search firm, state employment service, commercial agency career day
______% campus sponsored career days	______% other (please specify) ______
______% other (please specify) ______	

15. How does the number of campuses visited during the 1981-82 recruiting year compare with the average of the past five years?
    - ☐ visited more
    - ☐ visited the same number
    - ☐ visited fewer

16. What factor(s) determine whether a particular campus is included in the recruiting done by your organization? ______

17. Is membership in the College Placement Council and/or the regional college placement associations important to your overall college relations/recruiting efforts?

    ☐ Yes ☐ No

    Please explain ______

18. How might CPC or the regional associations be of greater assistance to you and your organization? ______

19. What in your judgement have been the greatest changes in college relations/recruiting over the past five years? ______

20. What in your judgement have been the greatest changes in college graduates over the past five years?

21. What in your judgement will be the greatest change(s) that college relations/recruiting will have to make over the next several years?

22. What do you consider the single-most important thing your college relations/recruiting program does or should do to assure productive recruting year in and year out?

23. Other than matters directly related to the economy, what do you see as the single greatest problem facing college relations/recruiting over the next several years?

24. Has your organization had to make any drastic changes due to the conditions of the job market or due to changes in recent college graduates (e.g., escalate salary offers beyond normal levels, be more thorough in candidate screening, re-locate certain operations to more desireable geographic areas, offer hiring bonuses or other incentives, etc.)?
☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, please explain

25. Does your organization offer hiring bonuses or other incentives to recent college graduates?
☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, for what disciplines (majors) are bonuses or other incentives offered?

26. Does your organization normally utilize employment agencies or search firms to hire recent college graduates into entry level positions?
☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, for what disciplines?

Do you pay the fee?
☐ Yes ☐ No

27. Do you feel that if Federal AA/EEO regulations were to be relaxed it would result in fewer members of protected classes being hired by your organization?
☐ Yes ☐ No

28. Have you had difficulty hiring individuals whose spouse was also college degreed and seeking professional employment (dual career couples)?
☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, has your company developed any type of program to accommodate the needs of both spouses? (please describe)

Thank you for your cooperation.
Copies of the complete study will be made available to employer members of the College Placement Council through the CPC Foundation.

Please return to:
Dr. Gary J. Scott
College Relations and Recruiting Survey
Career Planning and Placement Center
210 Swen Parson Hall
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115

APPENDIX B

THE CPC FOUNDATION

College Relations and Recruiting Survey
210 Swen Parson Hall
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL. 60115
Gary J. Scott, D.Ed.
Project Director

To: Selected Chief Executive Officers.

Please take a few minutes of your valuable time to complete the enclosed questionnaire which is part of a national study of college relations/recruiting activity. The study is commissioned by the CPC Foundation, the research arm of the College Placement Council, Inc. (CPC). Since this is the first major study of its kind, the results will provide employers of college graduates with both an accurate description of the present state of college relations/recruiting and guidelines for professional standards and future developments in the field.

Your organization was selected for the study from among all employers holding current membership in CPC or in one of the seven regional placement associations. Information is being sought from both the college relations/recruiting staffs as well as a sample of chief executive officers. A detailed questionnaire has already been sent to the persons(s) in your organization responsible for college relations/recruiting.

Enclosed you will find the questionnaire for you to complete. If you elect to have someone else complete the form, I only request that you select a person who would reflect your views toward the college relations/recruiting function. The completed questionnaire should be returned in the envelope provided by October 9.

Please be assured that neither you nor your organization will be identified by name in any reports or publications resulting from the study. Only summary data will be used in the final report and confidentiality of an individual organization's responses will be maintained.

The final report of this study will be made available through the CPC Foundation.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Gary J. Scott

Gary J. Scott, D.Ed.
Project Director

THE CPC FOUNDATION
SURVEY OF COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING ACTIVITIES

Please note: **All responses will remain confidential** and will be used only in aggregate form. The organizational data requested is important to the study so that proper classification by industry and size can be made. A complete report of findings will be made available through the CPC Foundation.

Organization Name: ______________________________

Title of Person Responding: ______________________________

Geographic Region (check that region where corporate offices of primary operations are located).

- ☐ Eastern
- ☐ Mid-Atlantic
- ☐ Southern
- ☐ Midwest
- ☐ Rocky Mountain
- ☐ Southwest
- ☐ Western

Please indicate the total number of employees in your organization:

- ☐ under 1000
- ☐ 1,001-2,500
- ☐ 2,501-5,000
- ☐ 5,001-10,000
- ☐ 10,001-15,000
- ☐ 15,001-20,000
- ☐ over 20,001 (please specify) ______________

Industry (check the one with which your organization is primarily known or associated).

- ☐ Accounting-Public
- ☐ Banking, Finance, Insurance
- ☐ Merchandising (Retail & Wholesale) & Services
- ☐ Aerospace, Electronics, & Instruments
- ☐ Automotive & Mechanical Equipment
- ☐ Building Materials Mfrs. & Construction
- ☐ Chemicals, Drugs & Allied Products
- ☐ Electrical Machinery & Equipment
- ☐ Food & Beverage Processing
- ☐ Glass, Paper, Packaging, & Allied Products
- ☐ Metals & Metal Products
- ☐ Petroleum & Allied Products (Inc. Nat. Gas)
- ☐ Research &/or Consulting Orgs.
- ☐ Tire & Rubber
- ☐ Utilities-Public (Inc. Transportation)
- ☐ Government-Federal
- ☐ Government-Local/State
- ☐ Non-Profit Orgs. & Educational Institutions

1. What degree of importance **do** you personally assign the college relations and recruiting function in your organization?
   ☐ High ☐ Moderate ☐ Low

2. Briefly, what are **your** specific expectations for your college relations and recruiting staff? ______________________________

   Are your expectations being met?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No

3. What do **you** consider to be the single most important thing your college relations and recruiting staff does or should be doing?

4. What in **your** judgement will be the greatest change(s) in college relations/recruiting over the next several years?

5. Please check each of the following college relations/recruiting activities in which **you** personally become involved.
   - ☐ establishing or approving hiring quotas.
   - ☐ establishing or approving starting salary offers.
   - ☐ establishing or approving budget.
   - ☐ establishing or approving policy.
   - ☐ on campus visits or contacts.
   - ☐ greeting candidates in the office.
   - ☐ encouraging executive participation in college relations/recruiting.
   - ☐ involvement in establishing criteria for evaluating college relations/recruiting.
   - ☐ reviewing the results of college relations/recruiting.
   - ☐ other (please specify) ______________

6. Do **you** feel that it is important for your organization to maintain a visibility on college campuses during periods of little or no hiring?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No

Thank you for your cooperation. Copies of the complete study will be made available to employer members of the College Placement Council through the CPC Foundation.

Please return by October 9 to: Dr. Gary J. Scott; College Relations and Recruiting Survey; Career Planning and Placement Center; 210 Swen Parson Hall; Northern Illinois University; DeKalb, IL 60115.

APPENDIX C

RESPONSE FROM COLLEGE RELATIONS AND RECRUITING MANAGERS BY INDUSTRY AND SIZE OF ORGANIZATION

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
INDUSTRY	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Accounting, Public	6	1	3	2	2	1	15
Banking, Finance, and Insurance	12	18	11	12	7	5	65
Merchandising (Retail and Wholesale) and Services	3	6	10	6	5	7	37
Aerospace, Electronics, and Instruments	11	18	19	12	8	20	88
Automotive, Tire and Rubber, and Mechanical Equipment	1	1	1	3	2	6	14
Building Materials Manufacturers and Construction	3	4	2	6	2	8	25
Chemicals, Drugs, and Allied Products	5	2	4	6	8	19	44
Electrical Machinery and Equipment	3	2	4	0	2	5	16
Food and Beverage Processing	1	3	1	5	6	4	20
Glass, Paper, Packaging, and Allied Products	2	3	2	1	9	7	24
Metals and Metal Products	7	6	6	10	5	12	46
Petroleum and Allied Products (Including Natural Gas)	3	7	8	3	5	11	37
Research and Consulting Organizations	15	5	3	3	1	1	28

(Continued)

	SIZE (Number of Employees)						
	Under 1,000	1,001-2,500	2,501-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	Over 20,000	TOTAL
Utilities--Public (Including Transportation)	3	10	10	17	5	16	61
Government--All Levels, and Non-Profit Organizations	8	1	6	6	1	9	31
N.E.C.	3	4	2	3	2	12	26
TOTAL	86	91	92	95	70	143	577 (29%)